This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06822840 6

James Lenox

THE WORKS

OF THE LATE

REV. THOMAS SCOTT,

RECTOR OF ASTON SANDFORD, BUCKS:

EDITED

BY JOHN SCOTT, A.M.

VICAR OF NORTH FERRIBY, AND MINISTER OF ST. MARY'S HULL.

VOL. IX.

CONTAINING

AN ANSWER TO RABBI CROOLL;

AND

LETTERS, &c. ON ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENTS.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR L. B. SEELEY AND SON, 169, FLEET-STREET.

1824.

L. B. SEELEY, WESTON GREEN, THAMES DITTON.

CONTENTS.

Page

I. ANSWER TO CROOLL'S RESTORATION OF ISRAEL..... 1

PREFACE..... 3

RABBI CROOLL'S WORK..... 9

THE ANSWER..... 137
On the Genealogies of Christ..... 144
The Messiah a *Saviour*..... 151
Whether the Messiah was to have an immediate human Father..... 158
Whether the Messiah was to be a mere man..... 164
On the time of the Messiah's coming..... 176
The coming of the Messiah and the restoration of Israel not coincident..... 196
What to be understood by the "times of the Gentiles" 209
What have been the effects of Jesus Christ's coming.. 219
The nature and triumphs of Christianity contrasted with those of Mohammedism..... 226
1. State of the countries in which each succeeded.. 226
2. Nature of the two religions..... 230
3. Means of their success, respectively..... 241

Page.
The Messiah for the Gentiles as well as for Israel.... 262
Miracles 290
How far they prove a divine mission..... 301
A new Covenant promised in the prophets..... 322
Whether the Messiah's kingdom was to be spiritual or 'absolutely earthly'..... 332
'The law of an Ambassador'..... 347
The Messiah a Preacher..... 355
The Messiah a Conqueror..... 357
'The Law of Noah'..... 365
'Seventy Nations'..... 368
The change of the Sabbath..... 382
Cessation of Sacrifices..... 389
The Priesthood of the Messiah..... 391
The Messiah a Prophet..... 397
'The Oral Law'..... 402
"The curse of the Law"..... 412
'What need have the gentiles of a Messiah?'..... 444
The doctrine of the Trinity..... 463
Mr. Crooll's OMISSIONS..... 483
On the reception which the Messiah was to meet with 484
On the death by which he was to be "cut off"..... 490
On his resurrection, glory, and kingdom..... 514
On the consequences, predicted and actual to the Jewish people..... 518
Conclusion..... 526

II. ON ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENTS..... 529

1. A LETTER ON CONFORMITY TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND..... 531

The Puritans..... 532
Is the Church of England unscriptural?..... 533
Unscriptural and *Antiscriptural*..... 534
Conformity when lawful, and when not..... 537
Infant Baptism..... 540

Page.
Independency 541
Presbyterianism 541
Discipline 542
Liturgies 545
Establishments 547

2. A Second Letter on the same Subject 558
What constitutes the Establishment 559
Appointment of Ministers 561
Comprehension, instead of *Selection*, objected to Establishments 562
Appeals to the Old Testament 565
Exclusion from the Lord's Supper 567
Meaning of the word *Church* 570
Ordination, what allowed by the Church of England. 572
Liturgies 574
Additional Remarks on Establishments 575
The Old Testament proves that they are not *evil in themselves* 576
It leads us to expect them in millennial times 578
The ministerial character, whether indelible 582
Advantages of our Establishment 583

3. An Essay on the Religious Establishment of Israel 591
No Religious Establishment at first under the Old Testament, any more than under the New 591
In what sense an Establishment was formed by Moses 593
Civil Government of Israel 596
Religious Establishment of Israel, properly so called, commenced with David 597
David and Solomon acted as inspired men 599
Not so the subsequent kings 602
Interposition of the Jewish kings in affairs of religion 603
And of the Rulers after the Babylonish Captivity 608
The conduct of these kings and governors not prescribed by the Mosaic law, but an example for Christian rulers 612

Page
Prophecies of the future times of the Church 613
Conduct of the Reformers..... 620
Luther uniformly opposed to persecution..... 621
His counsel to the Electors of Saxony 622
Authority, as well as Wealth, a talent to be improved 623
Conclusion 628

יֵשׁוּעַ בֶּן-מִרְיָם הוּא הַמָּשִׁיחַ:

AN ANSWER

TO RABBI JOSEPH CROOLL'S

'RESTORATION OF ISRAEL:'

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

'THE ORIGINAL WORK.

1814.

PREFACE.

A CONSIDERABLE time ago, a copy of the work which I here attempt to refute, was sent to me, by the Committee of the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, with a request that I would answer it. The same was done, as I understood, to a few other persons. Having looked into the book in rather a slight manner, and being fully engaged at the time, I was not at all inclined to undertake the service; thinking that some other person, more at leisure, would do it in a more adequate and acceptable manner.

But, being somewhat less engaged in the beginning of the present year, I again took up the work, and read it more attentively; purposing, if not too late, to make some short remarks on particular passages, and communicate them to any one who, I should learn, was preparing an answer.

In attempting this, however, the whole concern appeared to me in a new light; and I per-

ceived that by this work an opening was given to the zealous friends of Christianity, and cordial friends of the Jews, for bringing the whole subject in controversy between Christians and Jews before the public and the nation of Israel.

I am indeed free to acknowledge, that before I carefully studied Mr. Crooll's statements I had not well understood the subject; nor had I been aware of half of the objections, current opinions, and traditions, which stand in the way of a Jew, to prevent his embracing Christianity. The arguments adduced, indeed, did not appear either conclusive, or very difficult to be answered: but questions were started on almost every part of the subject, of which I had not previously thought; and, in some instances, I found that a considerable degree of plausibility was given to objections.

It is true, I understood that the original work was not to be published by the London Society without an answer: but it occurred to me, that, if it were not answered, the author might have to say, that he had, in some sense, challenged the Committee and friends of that Society to answer his work, but they were not able; and therefore that he at length published it himself, as unanswerable: or, at least, that the substance of it would in one form or other be circulated. On inquiry, I could not learn that any one was engaged in preparing an answer: and thus I was led on, step by step, at length to undertake the service: and, after many changes in my plans and arrangements, which have occasioned much delay.

the result is presented to the public in its present form.

I cannot but fear, however, that some Christian friends may question the propriety of publishing such a work, for the sake of answering it: and I am fully aware, that stating plausible objections, without a very satisfactory refutation of them, is, in all *ordinary* cases, a dangerous measure. But this appears to me not to be an *ordinary* case; but one which cogently requires something to be attempted; and I regard it as a most important opening to a fair and full investigation of the whole argument, which ought not to be neglected.

In fact, Jews have hitherto kept themselves within certain strong holds, and inaccessible recesses; making occasional incursions against Christianity; rather than attempted to lead forth their troops into the open field of fair argument: and Christians seem to have been so afraid of offending them, by clearly exhibiting the mysteries of our holy religion; that they have, as it were, kept the grand things to be contested in the back ground. But I rejoice that there is at length a prospect of the whole subject becoming more generally examined and understood.

It has been the opinion of several learned men, that nothing should be brought forward in this controversy, except the insulated question, Whether Jesus be, or be not, the promised Messiah; and that the peculiar doctrines of Christianity should

be kept out of sight. I own I once was favourable to this idea: but it is manifest from Mr. C.'s work, that these peculiar doctrines, or at least those views of Christianity which are maintained in the Creeds and Articles of our church, form so prominent a part of the objections of the Jews to the New Testament, that they are nearly inaccessible to all other arguments: and they must remain so, as far as I can perceive, till it is clearly shewn that these doctrines are contained in the Old Testament; or are not at all inconsistent with its leading principles. This, therefore, I have attempted: with what success others must decide. Many things, in the management of the argument, will appear to the Christian reader different from what he was prepared to expect or approve: as indeed, they are far different from what at first impressed my own mind. But to reason with Jews on the sole authoritative ground of the Old Testament, concerning Christianity and its most important doctrines, which we are accustomed to prove almost exclusively from the New Testament; is an undertaking attended with far more difficulties, than it may appear to be to those who never made the trial.

In respect of such Jews as may be induced to read this work, I can only intreat their candour and attention. I am conscious, before God, of most cordial good-will to the nation, and to every individual of it: but, as I am also deeply convinced of the truth and excellency of Christianity, I do earnestly long and daily pray f their conversion to their own Messiah, and c

most gracious Lord and Saviour. I have not indeed, in what I have written, declined to use all my ability, be it what it may: "I know not "to give flattering words;" and in a few instances I have hinted a gentle reprehension. I trust, however, that even Jews will allow me to be a fair, a candid, and a benevolent opponent; and that they will not say, that I have treated them disrespectfully, or with bitterness and severity.

Aston Sandford, October 4, 1814.

THE

RESTORATION

OF

ISRAEL:

BY RABBI JOSEPH CROOLL,

TEACHER OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

According to the days of thy coming out of the land of Egypt will I shew unto him marvellous things. MICAH vii. 15.

The breaker is come up before them; they have broken up, and have passed through the gate, and are gone out by it; and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them. MICAH ii. 13.

And their seed shall be known among the gentiles, and their offspring among the people; all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed. ISAIAH lxi. 9.

Prove all things; hold fast that which is good. 1 THESS. v. 21.

DECLARATION.

*If ever this book should fall into the hand of a Christian, the author would beg of him to consider the following observations.

First, It was written without any design to publish it, and only to satisfy the author's own opinion, as will be seen in the sequel. Secondly, It may be said that *the author is an enemy to Christians: to banish this idea, the following proof is offered.

* It is well known that at the time when the law was given to Israel all the seventy nations were worshippers of idols. By this way of worship there was no life for the gentiles to exist in God's world. But "the Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works:" he commanded to his people Israel to make intercession for all the gentile world, and also to offer sacrifices for them; and this was done during all the time that Israel dwelt in their own land. And every year, on the feast of Tabernacles, seventy young bullocks were offered for the seventy nations of this world, Numb. xxix. 13: the first day thirteen, the second twelve, the third eleven, the fourth

* The passages which are made the subject of particular remark in the answer are here distinguished by asterisks perfixed to them.

ten, the fifth nine, the sixth eight, and the seventh day seven.

In the time of Jeremiah the prophet, Nebuchadnezzar came to Jerusalem and took Jeconiah, at that time king, together with the queen, and a great number of the nation, captives, and brought them into Babylon. At the same time, Hananiah, a false prophet, spoke in the name of God, saying, "Within the space of two full years, all those that are in captivity in Babylon shall return." Jer. xxviii. 11. The prophet was commanded by God to write an epistle to the captives in Babylon. "And seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captives, and pray unto the Lord for it: for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace." Jer. xxix. 7.

It is well known that Israel never had any greater enemy than Nebuchadnezzar and his people; yet were our forefathers commanded by God to pray for them. *But how much more is it our duty to pray for the nations at the present time, in particular for this country, for here we are used well, and treated better than in any other country; here we enjoy ease and security. As for myself in particular, during the time I have resided in this country, I have received a great deal of kindness from both sexes. *But the real cause of writing this book was, from reading a small tract published by the Committee of THE LONDON SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIANITY AMONGST THE JEWS. And here I shall quote their own words: "If any doubts should yet remain in the mind of any person sincerely inquiring after truth, upon the heads discussed in

this address ; or if any new difficulties should present themselves ; it would give pleasure to any member of this Committee, to confer personally with such inquirer on the subject."—No. II. p. 12. —In the beginning of this paragraph it is said that they have answered almost every thing, and that a Jew has no more to say for himself. Considering these things, I thought I would search, and try to find if their statement was sufficient for the conviction of a Jew. And, after I set to work, I found fresh difficulties, by which it appears to me that they have yet answered nothing ; and, further, I think that those things which I have advanced in this book, it is impossible for the Committee to answer. All learned Christians will allow a Jew to suggest every difficulty which he thinks it impossible for a Christian to answer ; *but there are some ignorant Christians, who, as soon as a Jew advances any thing in his own behalf, will immediately say, he blasphemes. I hope that whoever reads this book will be a learned Christian, and will remember that a learned Committee have sent forth their publications to the Jews, on purpose to see if any Jew has any thing further to say. What difficulties I have found, I have declared in the following pages ; *and if the Committee are able to answer them, it may be good for both parties.

THE

RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.

---

*MESSIAH.—This name is applicable, 1. To a king; 2. To a prophet; 3. To a high priest. "And Jehu the son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint to be *king* over Israel; and Elisha the son of Shaphat, of Abel-meholah, shalt thou anoint to be *prophet* in thy room." 1 Kings xix. 16. "Thou shalt also take the *anointing* oil, and pour it upon his head and *anoint* him." Exod. xxix. 7. Also every one that is made a king is called a Messiah. "Thus saith the Lord to his *anointed*, to Cyrus," &c. Isaiah xlv. 1. This title is always given either to a king, to a ruler, or to a judge. "Behold thy *king* cometh unto thee." Zech. ix. 9. "Yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be *ruler* in Israel." Mic. v. 2. "But with righteousness shall he *judge* the poor." Isaiah xi. 4.

*HE IS TO BE ONLY A MAN.—"So shall they be my people, and I will be their God, and *David my servant* shall be king over them." Ezek. xxxvii. 24. "But they shall serve the Lord their God, and *David their king*, whom I will raise up unto them." Jer xxx. 9. "Afterwards shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and *David their king*." Hos. iii. 5.

*HE MUST HAVE BOTH FATHER AND MOTHER. —It is acknowledged by all that the Messiah was to be the Son of David: for this reason Jesus could not be the Messiah. And if it should be said that his mother was a daughter of David, that will not relieve the objection; for, if the daughter of David brings forth a son, he can by no means be called the son of David: for a son by a daughter has lost the very name of a son of David, although the son of his daughter. "And they assembled all the congregation together on the first day of the second month, and they declared their pedigrees after their families, by the house of their fathers," *but not by the house of their mothers*. Numb. i. 18. Here we may observe, that a daughter in Israel has no pedigree of herself; for, if the daughter of a priest be married to a man of another tribe, her son will be no priest; and, if a daughter of any tribe be married to a priest, and she brings forth a son, he will be a priest. Thus the pedigree of a man depends on his father only.

*A SAVIOUR—is not the name of the Messiah, but the name of God; for the Messiah himself shall look up to God to be saved. "He is just and shall be saved," Zech. ix. 9. Observe the word is נושע venousha: the proper sense of the word is, And he shall be saved, but not "to save himself." And again, "For I am the Lord, thy God, thy Saviour." Isaiah xliii. 3. "I, even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is no Saviour: ver. 11. "And all flesh shall know, that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Reedemer, the mighty one of Jacob." Isaiah xlix. 26. Happy art thou, O Israel;

a people saved by the Lord," (Deut. xxxiii. 29.) —but not by the Messiah.

* THE SON OF MAN.—Ezekiel the prophet is called by this name, and was called so by God. Jesus also called himself the Son of Man. We shall find it very difficult to settle by what name he ought to be called: for, if he is a God, he is no man; and, if he is a man, he is no God. Jesus himself never thought of such a thing; therefore he called himself the Son of Man: but, had he thought that he was a God, he would have called himself the Son of a woman; and that would have proved that no man could have been his father. But, if any man will contend that he was both God and man, it cannot be true: for we have the following text; "And there is none other that can shew it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh." Dan. ii. 11. "The heaven, even the heavens are the Lord's: but the earth hath he given to the children of men." Psalm cxv. 16. I think these proofs are sufficient to shew that he who partakes of flesh and blood, and eats and drinks, can be no God.

* FORGIVENESS OF SIN.—The Messiah can forgive no sin, but God whose dwelling is not with men, he only can forgive sin. "For there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared," and no other. Psalm cxxx. 4. Observe the term, "that thou mayest be feared," and no other; and therefore no flesh can forgive sin. Nay, even the Messiah must pray to God; and, inasmuch as the Messiah was to be born of a woman, he would consequently partake of flesh and blood, and the

nature of his person be formed only like that of another man.

* WHEN IS THE MESSIAH TO COME?—According to the belief of Christians, the Messiah is already come: but for this great point I wish to see scripture proof; and where is the proof? Will you bring forward the prophet Daniel? this is what you rely upon, and you have nothing else upon which you can rely. I shall quote the passage to shew it affords no argument in support of Christianity. "And after threescore and two weeks shall the Messiah be cut off, but not for himself; and the people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary: and the end thereof shall be with a flood; and to the end of the war desolations are determined." Dan. ix. 26. From this verse, and the 25th, it is an easy matter to prove that the Messiah was to be cut off after sixty-nine weeks; that is in the last week, or properly in the last seven years, before the temple was destroyed. But we find that Jesus was cut off more than six weeks, i. e. about thirty-seven years, before the temple was destroyed; and therefore he could not be the Messiah, but it must mean some other person.

Let us consider for a moment, that the captivity of Babylon was declared by the mouth of the prophet Jeremiah long before the people went into captivity: he said, There you shall be seventy years and no longer; and so it came to pass. But of how much consequence is the coming of the Messiah. If the seventy weeks are the only passage in the whole of the Old Testament, that

points out the coming of the Messiah, ought it not to be as exact as the prophet has declared it? but here we find the contrary; for there is a difference of thirty seven years: therefore Jesus could not be the Messiah.

Again; if the seventy weeks is the only passage to be found that points out the coming of the Messiah, * why did not one of the apostles quote it as a clear proof to convince the people by it? but we do not find that either Paul or any other brought forward this passage; therefore they could not have thought of such a thing; for they knew that it had no reference at all to the Messiah, and on this account did not quote it.

* We also read in this verse, that "the Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself:" this is not true, for no such thing is to be found in the Hebrew text, for the text has it *ve-en lo*, which signifies, "and not to him;" that is to say, that the Messiah, which means the king, shall be cut off in the last week; "and not to him;" i. e. he shall have no successor; by which is pointed out, that there shall be no more kingly power in the Jewish nation. *And this Messiah that was to be cut off was king Agrippa; and so it happened, that in the last week he and his son Monves were slain by the order of Titus.

Perhaps some people will ask, How came he to be called a Messiah? I have already shewn that a prophet, a high-priest, and a king, are called by the name of Messiah; also every one that is called a king is called a Messiah. Now Cyrus, who was a heathen king, is called a Messiah: (see page

15) how much more Agrippa, who was of the stock of Abraham and king over Israel.

* Thus far I have shewn here that the whole defence of the people that say, that the Messiah is come already, is no defence, because it proves nothing: * and therefore the coming of the Messiah until this day is unknown, and this mystery is only known to God,. and was never told to any of the prophets. "For the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come." Isaiah lxiii. 4. Learn now from this passage that the coming of the Messiah was never revealed to mankind. Again; "And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever, that it shall be for a time, times, and a half; and, when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished. And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end." Dan. xii. 7—9. Here it may be observed, that Daniel was longing to know the coming of the Messiah, but could not obtain it.

* THE MESSIAH IS NOT YET COME.—We must look upon this world as divided into three periods. The first was during the residence of Adam and Eve in paradise, and before they fell. The second period began, when Adam was driven out from paradise, and continued until the coming of the

Messiah. The third or last period will commence by the coming of the Messiah.

The first part was perfect. The middle part was imperfect. * The third part will restore the first perfection, and so continue for evermore.

In the first, man was perfect, that is, without sin; then he was an angel; for angels in heaven sin not, and where there is no sin, there is no death: by this we may learn that man was born to live for ever, because a perfect God created a perfect man; and, as God lives for ever, such was to be the nature of man: and so it was, because the proper habitation of man was paradise, and there he was to live for ever, he and his seed after him. We also know from scripture that paradise is upon earth, for we read in Genesis ii. 10, "And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads: and the names of these rivers are well known to the world. Now, when heaven and earth, and all the host of them were finished, then man and angels were both alike; heaven and earth were both alike, for the one was as holy as the other; nay, the degree of man was above the angels, for his wisdom was above theirs; * the angels could give no names to all living creatures, but Adam did, and until this day they bear the names which Adam gave them. Now one of the angels became jealous of the glory of man; this was Satan, who was at that time a very great angel in heaven; he rebelled against his Lord, descended upon earth, disguised himself in the figure of a serpent, succeeded according to his

wishes, and occasioned the fall of man. Here Adam lost all his former glory, and became miserable and fearful: he dreaded the appearance of his Maker, but at length was condemned to die, and driven out of paradise. Now at the time when Adam sinned all the generations were yet in his loins, and are therefore born in sin; and we know that sin is death: as all men are born in sin, they must all consequently die.

Thus man became a fallen creature, and will continue so * for six thousand years, according to the days of the creation of the world, but no longer. This is the second period, or properly the middle world, and its proper title, the wicked and ungodly world.

From all that is here advanced may clearly be seen, that the Messiah is not yet come; for the world must exist in a corrupt state six thousand years, and the question is, * of what use would his coming be? But, when this number shall be at an end, or nearly at an end, then will be the time of his coming; and then will commence the third period, or properly the NEW world, which will be called the world of the Messiah.

* THE NEW WORLD—will commence by the first appearance of the Messiah; the world will be restored to its former glory, a new heaven and a new earth will appear; the former will pass away; mankind will recover their primitive glory, * and will be above the angels; Satan and his band will be destroyed. The seventh day of the creation was the sabbath, and that day only received a blessing, and was set apart for ever to be observed

as a holy day; which was a type of the great sabbath, i. e. the world of the Messiah, which also will be called the blessed world.

* THE MESSIAH IS NOT YET COME.—We are assured by the prophet Isaiah, lix. 20, 21, that as long as Israel is dispersed abroad, the Messiah is not come: for by his coming the sin of Israel will be blotted out: and this prophetical declaration is confirmed by the apostle Paul; "And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins." Romans xi. 26, 27. First must be considered the term, "For this is my covenant." What is that covenant? To send them "the deliverer." For what? "to take away their sins." Here it must be acknowledged by every one, that when the Messiah shall come the sin of Israel will be taken away; and here is a clear proof that, as long as Israel is scattered, their sin is not taken away, and their continuance in their sins affords an evidence that the Messiah is not yet come.

* THAT THE MESSIAH IS NOT YET COME, may be confirmed by scripture: "And I will make your cities waste, and bring your temples into desolation.—And I will scatter you among the heathen; and the land of your enemies shall eat you up. And they that are left of you shall pine away in their iniquity in your enemies' lands; and also in the iniquities of their fathers shall they pine away with them. And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them

utterly, and to break my covenant with them: for I am the Lord their God. But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the heathen, that I might be their God; I am the Lord." Levit. xxvi. 31, 33, 38, 39, 44, 45. Here you may learn, that before the coming of the Messiah the first and second temple must be destroyed, the land of Israel laid waste, Israel scattered among all nations, and there to pine away in the sins of their fathers, and their own, * and afterwards the first covenant will be remembered, and Israel will be restored. But as Christ came before these times he could not be the Messiah.

THE MESSIAH IS NOT COME.—"Rejoice and be glad, O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz: the cup also shall pass through unto thee; thou shalt be drunken, and shalt make thyself naked. The punishment of thine iniquity is accomplished, O daughter of Zion; he will no more carry thee away into captivity. O daughter of Edom, he will discover thy sins." Lament. iv. 21, 22. It is well known that the prophet Jeremiah lived at the time of the destruction of the first temple: * the question here will be, How came the prophet to take notice of Edom? To which it may be answered, that it frequently happened, whilst a prophet was delivering the oracles of God, a new subject would on a sudden be revealed to his mind. So here the prophet lamented over Jerusalem and her people: on a sudden was shewn to him a great lamentation, that is, the burning of the second temple by Edom, and the present long captivity: but at the same time was

also shewn to him the downfal of Edom, and the redemption of Israel; and, when he had finished this short prophecy, he began again with his former subject, that is, with the fifth chapter of the Lamentations.

This short prophecy must be well considered. First, the prophet tells Edom to "rejoice and be glad" of the downfal of Israel: but know, says he, that a day is appointed for you also; and that day will be when the sin of Israel shall be accomplished, and that will be the day when thy sin shall be discovered, and from thence Israel shall no more be carried away into captivity. Here is a plain proof that the rise of Israel depends on the downfal of Edom. Secondly, as long as Edom is master, Israel must remain a prisoner. Thirdly, so long as Israel is a prisoner, his sins are not accomplished, and as long as they are not accomplished, the measure of Edom is not full; for these two points must come to pass at once, that the one shall finish his sin, and the other shall only commence to pay his debts. Now, if any honest man will consider this argument, he must acknowledge that the Messiah is not yet come. But, if any person will still contend that the Messiah is come, then let him answer this question: The prophet says, "The punishment of thine iniquity is accomplished, O daughter of Zion; he will no more carry thee away into captivity." Consider well the text, that, when the sin of Israel shall be finished, he will no more be in captivity. This prophecy was declared more than * five hundred years before Christ. Now tell me, of what use was his coming? * He could do no good to Israel;

and what can be a clearer proof than the present captivity, that the period for the coming of the Messiah was not at that time? Secondly, the whole world is witness that Edom is not yet fallen? but what is the proof that Edom is not yet fallen? The proof is, the captivity of Israel; for the moment Edom shall fall the captivity of Israel shall be ended, and Israel shall be restored; and that is the proper time for the coming of the Messiah, but not before. Thus far it is proved that the Messiah is not come.

* PROOF FROM THE GOSPEL THAT CHRIST WAS NOT THE MESSIAH.—And Christ "went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him, to shew him the buildings of the temple. And Christ said unto them, See ye all these things? verily I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." Matt. xxiv. 1, 2. "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the gentiles, until the times of the gentiles be fulfilled." Luke xxi. 24. Here Christ gave instruction to his disciples, by telling them that Jerusalem must be destroyed, and Israel must fall by the sword, and be led captive among all nations. Now here he testifies that he was not the Messiah; for by the coming of the Messiah Israel will be restored, but not to go into a fresh captivity. Further he says that "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the gentiles," and that the people shall be in captivity, "until the times of the gentiles shall be fulfilled." This is true, that Israel shall be dispersed until the measure of the

iniquities of the gentiles shall be full; at that time Israel shall be accomplished, and the punishment of the gentiles shall commence.

We find that God said the same to Abraham; "Thy seed shall be in captivity until the fourth generation, then they shall be restored; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." Genesis xv. 16. * This declaration is confirmed by the Apostle Paul: "Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the gentile." Rom. ii. 9. Here we learn that, when Jew and gentile both are found guilty, the Jew is the first to be punished; and, when the Jew has suffered out his time, the gentile comes next. "But glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the gentile." v. 10. From these passages we may learn, that both in punishment and reward the Jew is first, and after comes the gentile. * You see here plainly that Paul meant nothing else but this: that, when Israel should have finished their sufferings, at that time the measure of the gentiles would be just full. But in regard of reward it will be the contrary, for Israel will be the first, "Saying, hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads. And I heard the number of them which were sealed; and there were sealed one hundred and forty and four thousand," that is, of each tribe of Israel twelve thousand. "After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations," &c. Rev. vii. 3, 4, 9.

I should wish that the reader would take notice

of "all nations," and he will be much surprised to find, * that out of all nations not one of the gentile world shall be worthy to be called the servant of God, but he who is to be called, is only a Jew. And we find the same in the Old Testament; that Israel were always the sufferers before any other nations; but afterwards they followed them. "And it shall be, if they refuse to take the cup at thine hand to drink, then shalt thou say unto them: Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Ye shall certainly drink. For lo, I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and should ye be utterly unpunished? ye shall not be unpunished." Jer. xxv. 28, 29. But in the great day of Israel we find that those Egyptians, who were their lords and masters, were very glad even to follow them, and that not a few, but in great numbers, Exod. xii. 38. * Now, when the second great day of Israel shall once come, it will be so again, even among all nations, that they who were lords, nay kings and princes, will be glad "to lay hold of the skirt of a Jew." Zech. viii. 23. From this last proof, I wish to know, * where is the boasting of the gentiles, since Christ was not the Messiah?

* By the Witness of the Gospel that Christ was not the Messiah.—"And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" Matt. xxiv. 3. "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." v. 34. * Here he appointed a fixed time for his second coming, and that fixed time could not be very long. I will

allow for that generation a hundred years, now this year is 1811, and yet he is not come. If he was the Messiah, then his fixed time must have been accomplished; but as he did not come, it is a clear proof that he was no Messiah.

THE MESSIAH IS NOT YET COME.—* When the Messiah shall come, all the sons of Adam will be of one language, and all of them shall worship the true God: but we see, both before and after the coming of Christ, no change took place among the nations; the different languages, the different worships, continue even unto this day; * so that his coming was of no use, and therefore he could not be the Messiah.

Perhaps some people will say, that his coming was of great benefit to numbers of nations, because he taught them the true worship. This is a poor defence, and without foundation; for we find that six hundred years after Christ * a man arose by the name of Mohammed, and established a new religion, and has now many more followers than Christ. At this very day, if I ask a Turk which is the only true religion, he will say, that of Mohammed: if I ask the same question of a Christian, he will say that there is no religion upon the face of the world that can be called true, except that of Christ; but if I should ask a Christian concerning Mohammed, his answer will be that Mohammed was an impostor. If a Turk should say to a Christian, What is the principal foundation of your religion? he would say, * I believe in a Trinity, that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Here the Turk will contradict him, saying, It is not true: for I as a Turk believe no such

thing; for there is no more than one true God. Do you observe here, that the one will contradict the other: now where will they both run for assistance? even to Moses, and both of them will confess that the law of Moses is the law of God: and here *the Jew will laugh at them both, because no *lawsuit can stand without two witnesses at least; and here the Turk cannot produce even one witness; for neither the Jew nor the Christian will be his witness: neither will the Jew or the Turk bear witness to the Christian; but both of them will bear witness that the law of Moses is the law of God: and here the Jew has two witnesses; his lawsuit must gain the cause.

Now, if the law of Israel is the law of God, then both the former will come to nothing.

Christ thought to build for himself *a castle in this world; but he could not find a piece of ground: what did he then? he observed the castle of Moses extending on every side; he thought to himself, Although there is no room for me, yet will I build a castle: so he crept up on the top of Moses' castle, and there in one corner he erected one for himself. Afterwards Mohammed passed by, and observing one castle built on the top of the other, began to laugh, and said, I observe the other corner will suit me, and here I also will build my castle: he was as good as his word, and built himself a castle at the other corner. Each of them dwelt in his own castle; *good fortune attended them; both of them prospered: yet still, day and night, both of them were afraid, and their whole lives were spent in fear; for they thought that, if Moses should one day come to

visit his castle he would be surprised to find two castles built on the top of his, and in a great rage he would command one of his tempests, saying, Go ye, and pluck them both off, and carry them away, and let me see no more of them. This will be the end of both castles; *but the castle of Moses will stand for ever.

THE MESSIAH IS NOT YET COME.—*It was ordained that there should be four empires: three have passed away already; the fourth, or last, is the Roman empire, and by the coming of the Messiah this last will come to nothing. But we find that by the coming of Christ the Roman Empire was not destroyed; and now, one thousand eight hundred and eleven years since Christ, the Roman Empire is still in power: this must prove that he was not the Messiah. But is the

*MESSIAH TO COME TWICE?—Some people will say, Yes; that he is come once, and will come a second time: but this must be proved before it can be believed; but where is the proof? The proof must be brought from the Old Testament; and what will they find there? by which of the prophets will they find that the Messiah is to come twice? They can produce none; but still they have found something, and upon that every thing is built. Daniel is the prophet on whom they lay hold: this we will try, this we will examine, and then we shall see how the matter will end. The following is the passage they quote from this prophet: "Thou, O king, sawest, and, behold a great image; this great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee, and the form thereof was terrible; this image's head

was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass; his legs of iron; his feet, part of iron and part of clay. Dan. ii. 31—33. * It pleased God to shew to Nebuchadnezzar in a dream what should come to pass until the coming of the Messiah, and that there should be four empires until that time. The first of these four was the head of fine gold; this was Nebuchadnezzar, or Babylon. The second was the breast and arms of silver; this was to be Persia and Media. The third was Greece, or his belly and thighs of brass; this was Alexander the Great. The fourth was the iron legs; which represented the Romans. This last was to be divided in process of time, that is, his feet, part of iron and part of clay.—Five ages must be considered here, and in one of them the Messiah is to come. Every one will acknowledge that the time for the coming of the Messiah was neither during the time of the first, the time of the second, nor the time of the third; it must remain, that the coming of the Messiah was, or is to be, during the time of the fourth, or last empire. And here we must notice that the fourth is represented, first in great power, afterwards to be divided? The question will be, was the Messiah to come when the Romans were in great power, or after they were divided? I say that his time could not be whilst the Romans were in full power, nor until that great power was divided. It is well known that to each of these four empires was ordained a number of years, at the end of which the second appeared and took its place. It would be a vain thing to say that Cyrus came and took the empire of Nebuchadnezzar,

because Babylon was to have the dominion for seventy years, and when Cyrus succeeded Nebuchadnezzar, or Babylon, just at that time ended the seventy years. In the same manner every one of the four had a fixed number of years, and, at the moment one had finished his number of years, immediately the other came forward and succeeded it. The question will therefore be, of what use was the coming of Christ in the time of Augustus, or in the time of Tiberius? It is well known that Rome was then in the zenith of her power. The Messiah when he comes will have the whole power to himself, and in the same manner as the former empires had it; *and how could it be that the Messiah, who was to subdue, was taken and subdued by the Romans, and even lost his life?

Secondly; it is impossible to say that the Messiah came in the time of the Romans, as at that time it was the stated period of Rome, *and the Messiah could not come before the end of the fourth or Roman empire.

Thirdly; let us further examine the text and see: "His legs of iron; his feet, part of iron and part of clay." v. 33. "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces." v. 34. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." v. 35.

*The person who has eyes and understanding can see that the time of the Messiah was not until the fourth empire became divided. And further observe, that he is to make his appearance at that time when the image shall have his power in the foot; and when he smote the image he did not smite the head, because Babylon passed away a long time before; neither did he smite the silver, because that was no more; neither did he smite the belly, which was Greece, because that was no more; nor did he smite the iron legs, or the Romans, for how could he smite any of them when they were no more? he could smite none, except that part which was then existing; and here we find that when the Messiah comes, he will find that all the four empires are swallowed up by the feet, and there lies the whole power; and that power he will smite, and bring them to nothing, *and he will smite them only once, for so says the prophet Daniel: and here is a plain proof that the Messiah by his appearance at the first time will finish every thing, and who is he that will contradict the prophet to say, that he will come twice? And, by all these statements here advanced, it is clearly proved that the Messiah is not come yet.

But here we may ask a question, Is the Son of David to be the Messiah of the Gentiles or of the Jews?—I say, of the Jews only; and

*No Messiah for the Gentiles.—Thus we prove it. Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem, * behold thy king cometh, but not the king of the gentiles—*unto thee* but not to another. Zech. ix. 9.

By this passage we may learn that, when the Messiah shall come, the daughters of Jerusalem will rejoice greatly, because he will restore them, and then the people will shout for joy. But by the coming of Christ, Israel was not restored, but scattered; they had no joy, but lamentations. Here you see that he was not the Messiah: and, if he was not, then the gentiles have none.

Secondly; Israel shall have occasion to rejoice with his mother Jerusalem; because the mother will receive her children again, and be built up again: but what joy can there be for the gentiles, the destroyer of Jerusalem and her children? *Again; "Let Israel rejoice in him that made him; let the children of Zion be joyful in their king." Psalm cxlix. 2. Again; "But they shall "serve the Lord their God, and David their king:" observe *their* king. Jer. xxx. 9. Again; "The breaker is come up before them, they have broken up, and have passed through the gate, and are gone out by it: and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them." Micah ii. 13.

Thus far I have proved *that there is no Messiah for the gentiles, and no joy have they to expect by his coming, but on the contrary; for behold in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehosaphat; and will plead with them there for my people, and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations and parted my land. Assemble yourselves and come all ye heathen, and gather yourselves together round about thither; cause

thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord; for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about: but in that day the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel." Joel iii. 1, 2, 11, 12, 16.

*No MESSIAH FOR THE GENTILES,—by the proof of their gospel. And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah, for out of thee shall come a govenor that shall rule my people Israel, but not the gentiles. Matt. ii. 6. And again; * "But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Matt. xix. 24. Again; * "When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." xix. 28. Again; "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Luke xxii. 30.

Here I observe 1. That the Messiah shall be called a king of Israel. 2. That when he comes he will be sent only to Israel but not to the Gentiles. 3. That *Christ forgot the whole world, and glories in nothing but judging Israel; and, if he is to be Messiah to the Gentiles also, why did he not say, And ye shall sit upon twelve thrones judging all nations, or at least judging the twelve tribes of Israel, also the gentiles? Neither do we see that his apostles asked him any questions, saying, And what will be the condition of the gentiles? You see here *neither Christ nor the apostles took any notice of the gentiles, as if only Israel was the whole world; and therefore it is plain, that there is NO MESSIAH FOR THE GENTILES.

" * Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Philip. ii. 6. From this passage we may learn that he was no Messiah, much less a God.

* Hitherto we have proved that the Messiah is not yet come, and that there is no Messiah for the gentiles, and that Christ was not the promised Messiah : and I will bring only one proof more that

CHRIST WAS NOT THE MESSIAH.—" For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak." John xii. 49. I ask, 1. What was his commission? * " I am sent only to the house of Israel." Matt. xv. 24 : this was his commission. 2. * Why did they not believe him, if he was sent as the Messiah? * Whose word will stand, the word of God, or the word of man?

We find, * when Moses was sent to Israel they believed him ; but now, how is it that God sent the Messiah to his people, and they would not receive him? By this it appears that the word of man will be established before the word of God. * God said Yes, but I Israel said No.

GOD KNOWS THE FUTURE.—He foreknew, therefore, that Israel would not receive Christ: * to what purpose was he then sent? * did God intend to impose on his firstborn son Israel, and lay before him a great stumbling block that he might fall? Let us see how this matter ended: first, * the word of God came to nothing ; secondly, the Messiah was despised and rejected ; and thirdly lost his life.

* We also learn from the words of the apostle Paul; " For God hath concluded them all in

unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." Romans xi. 32. But hear the words of Christ; he says, "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." What is here to be done, if the words of Paul are true then the question will remain, Why was Christ then sent to Israel? It appears plain from the words of Paul, *that, had Israel received him he never would have been the Messiah of the gentiles; but in favour of the gentiles Israel was made blind on purpose to save the gentiles; and afterwards Israel was to be made guilty, and was punished, because they despised the word of God, and slew the Messiah.

Can it be believed that a true God would do wrong, and impose on his creatures, purposely that they should fall? Will not every man of understanding say that God is true, and all his actions perfect? If this be acknowledged, then Christ could never have been sent by God; and so it will be proved that God is a true and a just God; for his delight is to save his creatures, but not to destroy them without cause: and even those who do offend him wilfully, yet their punishment is executed in mercy; for that is his name, to pity the work of his hand; and if Christ had been sent by him, certainly he would have been received by Israel; but, as he was not sent by God, then the word of God was not prophaned by Israel, and he received due punishment, for by the law he was guilty: and this is a proof that he was not the Messiah; *"For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the

sower, and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereunto I sent it." Isaiah lv. 10, 11.

These passages will teach us, that, at the time when God shall send the true Messiah, he will prosper, and Israel will receive him, and that he will accomplish every thing: but see here what is further said; "For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace; the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands." v. 12. Here you may observe, * that when he is sent he will be the leader of Israel, and will restore them to their own land with great joy. Nothing can be more true than the following passage; *"Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Philip. ii. 6. On this account he could not prosper: because he wished to set up for himself, and to be equal with God: but, when the Royal Messiah shall come, he will not say that he is a God; but he will say, * The Lord God of our forefathers has sent me to bring you home; I am the son of David, and the servant of our God, who has anointed me to be your Messiah.

Only one thing more we have to examine, which is, WAS THE MESSIAH OF THE GENTILES A PROPHET OR NOT? I think not. I do not speak of myself, but every thing I advance is proved by the holy scripture. *"We see not our signs, there is no more any prophet, nor is there among us any that knoweth how long it will be so." Ps.

lxxiv. 9. By the whole of this Psalm, it is to be observed that the prophet complaineth of the desolation of the sanctuary, and of the miserable state of Israel in this long captivity. In former times our forefathers had seen signs and wonders; they had also among them prophets; but since our sanctuary is destroyed we have no more a prophet. Every one may learn that this psalm speaks concerning the present dispersion of Israel, and that until the restoration they shall have no prophet. This will shew that Jesus was no prophet.

DANIEL.—* In the book of this prophet we have it thus; "The commandment came forth to seal up visions, and prophecy:" ix. 24. But mark here, in the text it is not said *prophecy*, but the proper meaning is *a prophet*; that is, there shall be no more a prophet: and accordingly we find that Malachi was the last of all the prophets, and that until the restoration of Israel there shall be no other prophet.—* One thing more you ought to know, which is, that the coming of the Messiah, or the restoration of Israel, is all the same; both mean one thing, for the Messiah is Israel, and Israel is the Messiah.

* The next prophet who will appear in this world will be the Messiah, and from thence prophecy will cease no more; and so we are told by the word of God. "And it shall come to pass afterwards that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit. And I will shew

wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke." Joel ii. 28—30. Learn here that whatever is declared by the mouth of the prophet will come to pass by the restoration, but not before.—* Thus far it is proved, that Jesus was no God, no Messiah, and no prophet.

* THE GENTILES QUESTION.—Only one question is left for me to ask, which is, How a Jew will account for the miracles which Jesus wrought?

* THE ANSWER OF THE JEWS.—Miracles are a poor and miserable defence in behalf of the coming of the Messiah. Miracles are no sign of his coming; for bad and wicked men also can do miracles, and shew wonders. First, we find that those miracles which Moses performed, in the sight of Pharaoh and his people, were done by the power of God; * yet we find that the wise men of Pharaoh performed also the same miracles that Moses did; and we have the testimony of scripture that these wise men are called sorcerers, magicians, and that their doings were by enchantment.

* To drive devils out of possessed men is no miracle at all; for we find a common man could do it. See Josephus, book viii, page 118. * Nay, they have even power to prophesy; for the damsel possessed with the spirit of divination was able to prophesy. Acts xvi. 16. By the art of enchantment, and by witchcraft, men may do great wonders. In the second epistle to Timothy iii. 8. we read of two men in the time of Moses by the name of Jannes and Jambres; according to tradition, these two men were the heads of all the wise men of Pharaoh; and when the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea, *

these two men flew out the sea like winged fowls, but they were soon brought down. * Symbols,[1] they also prophesied, but all by the works of the devil. And, if we look into ancient and modern historians, it will be found that numbers have performed wonders, and all by enchantment; but none of them can say, I command that a fire shall come down from heaven: none of them can say, I command the sun to stand still.

Observe what is said: "And the Pharisees came forth and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven. And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and said, Why doth this generation seek after a sign? verily I say unto you, * There shall no sign be given unto this generation. And he left them, and entering into the ship again departed to the other side." Mark viii. 11—13. Here we may observe, If Jesus was the true Messiah, * it was his duty to have complied with all their requests; for, if not, why should they believe him? but what shall we say here? he who could shew no sign from heaven, himself teaches the world that they should give no credit if any person should come and say, I am the Messiah, and here I will shew you signs and wonders; he says, "Believe him not, for there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if it were possible they shall deceive the very elect: believe it not." Matt. xxiv. 24, 26. You see here, that bad and wicked men may shew great signs and wonders,

[1] There can be no doubt, I conceive, that the word *symbols* has been here substituted, probably by a mistake of the printer, for *Sybils*.—J. S.

and yet does Jesus himself say, Believe not. Now the question will be, Why should any one believe his miracles, and not believe another? what is the proof that he should be believed? there is none. Hence you may learn, that miracles are no evidence of the coming of the Messiah. Now, if miracles are no proof, then he was not the Messiah, and was no more than another person. Further I shall come to shew you, that even a prophet cannot be established by miracles. Moses, * the Lord of all the prophets, although he has shewn signs and wonders in the sight of nations, yet was not established as a prophet sent by God, until the giving of the law. But did Moses perform miracles, that Israel should believe him to be the prophet of God? no; for we read thus: * "And I will stretch out my hand, and smite Egypt with all my wonders, which I will do in the midst thereof: and after that he will let you go." Exod. iii. 20. "And Moses answered and said, But, behold, they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice: for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee." iv. 1. You see here, God said to Moses that he should do wonders, and they would believe him: but Moses knew that miracles were not sufficient to convince them that he was sent by God, therefore he said, Behold, they will not believe me. Then God said, It is true what thou sayest; but I will give you a particular mark, whereby Israel will believe that I have sent you; "And he said, Certainly I will be with thee; and this shall be a token unto thee, that I have sent thee; When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt,

ye shall serve God upon this mountain." iii. 12. Here we are instructed, * that miracles did not establish Moses as a prophet, until the giving of the law. Now, in the case of Moses, he could not bring forth Israel out of Egypt without miracles; for see here the answer of Pharaoh: "And Pharaoh said, Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go?" v. 2. In this case Moses was forced to shew some miracles, to convince Pharaoh that there was a Lord above him; and yet, after nine miracles were performed, the heart of Pharaoh still remained hard, until the last of the ten; then he let Israel depart. Although Pharaoh and his people were plagued ten times, yet again he assumed courage, took his army and followed them unto the Red Sea: in this case again no alternative was left for Israel, but either to return to Egypt, or to cast themselves into the sea? What could Moses do here? nothing else but by a miracle to shew to Pharaoh that there was a Lord above him: the sea was divided, the one party walked over on dry foot, but the other party perished. * In the same manner, all the miracles which were done in the desert were necessary things, but not to establish himself as a prophet: for, although Israel had seen signs and wonders, yet still did not all Israel believe that he was sent by God; for, whenever they wished or longed for any thing, and Moses did not fulfil their desires immediately, they murmured. Thus they went on only for fifty days, and then the whole nation was brought forth out of the camp to meet

with God, and they stood at the nether part of the mount: here all the men of Israel, their wives, their sons, and their daughters all stood. Exod. xix. 17.

Now, * to make them all fit to hear the voice of the great God of Israel, the Holy Spirit was poured out upon each that stood there, and * thus became a whole nation, in one moment, prophets; for who is able to hear the voice of God, if he is not holy? * We find that afterward, when any one of the prophets was inspired, at that very time he lost the use of all his limbs; he lay like dead, and when he recovered he knew his commission. With all the prophets God spoke either in a dream or in a vision, except that with Moses he spoke mouth to mouth.

Now learn from the children of the fathers all the prophets were the children of that generation which came forth out of Egypt; but here, to the fathers and mothers he spoke face to face; for so it is written in the text: "The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount, out of the midst of the fire." Deut. v. 4. Every one must acknowledge that at that time each of the nation was a prophet; and here the Lord gave his law to a nation of prophets. This was the day for Moses to be established as a prophet of God; every man of Israel, every woman of Israel, knew now that Moses was the man whom God had chosen; and the whole nation cried out, and said, "Behold the Lord our God hath shewed us his glory and his greatness, and we have heard his voice out of the midst of the fire: we have seen this day that God doth talk with man and he liveth." Deut. v. 24. Observe the term; "We have seen this day that God doth talk with man and he liveth." Here you

may learn, that until now they did not believe that God ever spake to man; but now they believed, and said, "For who is there of all flesh, that hath heard the voice of the living God speaking out of the midst of the fire, and lived?" v. 26. This was the time when all Israel believed that the miracles which Moses had wrought in Egypt, by the Red Sea, in the wilderness, were all performed by the power of God; thenceforward they believed whatever he told them. On this account the people said unto him, "Go thou near and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee; and we will hear it and do it," v. 27.

Thus far I have proved, that a prophet cannot be established by miracles: for miracles can be performed even by bad and wicked men.

* THE AUTHORITY AND POWER OF THE LAW OF MOSES ESTABLISHLD FOR EVER, AS WELL IN HEAVEN, AS ALSO UPON EARTH; AND THERE NEVER WILL BE ANY OTHER LAW EXCEPT THIS.—In the book of Deuteronomy, chap. xxviii, is pronounced the blessing for obedience, and the curses for disobedience. In chapter xxx we read thus: "And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee," &c. v. 1—10. Moses, the great prophet, foretold Israel what would befal them; "For I know that after my death ye will utterly corrupt yourselves, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you; and evil will befal you in the latter days; because ye will do evil in

the sight of the Lord," &c. xxxi. 29. In chap. xxviii. xxix. he tells the people that they will be "scattered among all nations;" that they will have no king, no land, no temple; and in that condition they will "abide for many days."—Further, he gave them advice how to proceed, and by what means they might recover their land, their temple, and their king. From the beginning of the first verse to the eleventh, we may learn, 1. that there is a promise that in the latter days Israel will return to the Lord their God: 2. He will restore them to their own land again: 3. The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul that thou mayest live:" 4. "And the Lord thy God will put all these curses upon thine enemies; if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which are written in this book of the law." Deut. xxx. 10. * Let every one observe these ten verses, and then he will acknowledge that the law of Moses is in full power at this day, just as it was in the time of Moses. Now, if the law of Moses is in full force this day, it will prove that there is no other law; and, if there is no other law, then the boasting of all the gentile world is put away, and it will remain that among Israel only are to be found the oracles of God. * The law of Moses is perfect. The gentiles say, it is imperfect: on this account the law is abolished, and a better one established. But we ought never to speak at random to establish any thing: sufficient proof ought to be given, in particular where it concerns the honour and

glory of the great Creator of heaven and earth. If the law is imperfect, then you must say also that God is imperfect; because this law is called the law of God, and who will dare to say that a perfect God established an imperfect law.

This law tells us that God is perfect: "He is the Rock, his work is perfect." Deut. xxxii. 4. "As for God, his way is perfect, the word of the Lord is tried." Psalm xviii. 30. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure." Psalm xix. 7.

What will you say here? * I have produced two witnesses; the one, Moses the man of God; the other, king David the man of God; both of them tell you that the law is perfect, and whatever is perfect is finished and complete: now it is your duty to bring forward two witnesses, of equal character, and let them prove that the above witnesses' testimony is false. But the question will be, who are your two witnesses? Can you produce two men able to stand, and to contend with Moses and David? No you cannot. They both say, a perfect God has given a perfect law; but look here, stand in awe: "And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." Exod. xxxii. 16. * These two tables contained the whole law; for * in the Ten Commandments there are six hundred and thirteen letters, and each letter stands for one command, and in the whole law of Moses there are six hundred and thirteen commandments: and such was the power of these two tables that it contained the complete law of Moses. Thus far it is proved, that a perfect God gave a perfect law:

and, if so, it contains every thing, and sufficient to make happy all the sons of Adam.

But here the gentile world will say that this statement is not true, because this law was given only to Israel, but not to the gentiles; and therefore * this law cannot make happy all the sons of Adam. To this I answer, that it is true, the law was given only to Israel, and that this law is called the inheritance of Israel. Moses commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob." Deut. xxxiii. 4. Why did God give the law for an inheritance to Israel, and not to any other nation, nor to all nations? forasmuch as all nations are his creatures, * he ought to have given the law to all of them. We find that the sons of Japhet, Ham, and Shem, * were in number seventy: they multiplied greatly, "And they said one to another, Let us build a city and a tower, and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered upon the face of the whole earth." Gen. xi. 14. The whole proceeding of this second world was to rebel against God. The Lord said, their punishment should be that which they were afraid of; * they said, Lest we be scattered; and God said, They shall be scattered. Then the Lord said to his heavenly Sanhedrin, or the seventy angels that minister unto him, "Let us go down and there confound their language." v. 7. Here lots were cast, and that family which fell in the lot of Gabriel, he became the guardian angel of that family; and in this manner the seventy families were divided among the seventy angels. These seventy families became afterward seventy nations; so every nation had a prince in heaven,

when all these things were finished. Then the Lord "scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of the whole earth." v. 8. And every family was directed by his guardian angel to that land which was given to them: Tarshish went and settled in that land; Cush, the son of Ham, went to Ethiopia; Ophir, the son of Shem, went to that part which was afterwards known by his name, the land of Ophir; and so did all the rest. * At that time Abraham was forty-eight years old; he saw the wickedness of the new little world; he told them the Lord certainly would punish them for their rebellion; but they despised his good advice: * he cursed them, and said, "Destroy, O Lord! and divide their tongues." Psalm lv. 9. At that time Abraham was the only man upon the face of the earth who worshipped the true God. We just mentioned that the lot was cast among the heavenly Sanhedrin; the lot which fell to the portion of God was Abraham and his family; as it is written, "For the Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance." Deut. xxxii. 9. The fathers who went down into Egypt were seventy; for so it is written, "And all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy." Exod. i. 5. According to this number the gentile world was established; that is, each of these seventy persons represented one nation; and so we are informed by the word of God. "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel." Deut. xxxii. 8.

Here we may learn that the * lot of God was in

number as much as that of all the seventy angels. The division of tongues was a punishment to the sons of Adam, on account of their rebellion, for which reason they were scattered abroad; only * one good family was found among them all, and that family fell to the lot of God. What was here to be done? Should God cast away a godly portion, and instead of it take a wicked one? Certainly not, for wickedness is an abomination unto the Lord. God is good, and his delight is in good; he therefore gloried in his godly portion. Now God had a holy law: to whom was it proper to give it, to a wicked family, or to his own family? Every one will say, that no family had * a right to his oracles except his own, and this was no more than justice; and therefore he gave the law for an inheritance to Israel. "Moses commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob." Deut. xxxiii. 4. Here you see, * as an act of justice, and lawfully, the oracles of God belonged to no nation except to Israel. It must be acknowledged, that those to whom the oracles of God are committed must alone be the ministers of God.

Question.—We know that God is good and merciful to all his creatures: did God glory only in his own lot? Has he cast away the seventy lots which he gave to the seventy angels? Are they not also his? Is he not the Lord of heaven and earth? Are the oracles of God to make happy only one family, and must all the rest perish?

Answer.—Although the oracles of God are the inheritance of Israel alone, yet the nations are not deprived of its benefit. The one is bound to take care of it, because it was given into their charge;

the other has no charge, and is not bound to take care of it; but they may come and unite themselves, and partake the same benefit: nay, *they are called and invited by the word of the Lord of it; and here I will give you the very words of the invitation. "Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it. Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people." Isaiah lvi. 2—7. Here it is proved, that all nations are called to the law, and he who comes to it has a promise beforehand to be happy; but upon condition he observes the sabbath, and the other commandments; *for he who will be a sharer of the benefit of the oracles of God must observe what is written in them. —Further, you may consider the great charge to Israel concerning strangers that come to join them. First, attend to the command of Moses. "He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment. Love ye therefore the stranger, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." Deut. x.

18, 19. Again, they are almost made equal with Israel even in the day of the restoration. "So shall ye divide this land unto you according to the tribes of Israel. And it shall come to pass, that ye shall divide it by lot for an inheritance unto you, and to the strangers that sojourn among you, which shall beget children among you: and they shall be unto you as born in the country among the children of Israel; they shall have inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel. And it shall come to pass that in what tribe the stranger sojourneth, there shall ye give him his inheritance, saith the Lord God." Ezek. xlvii. 21—23. *Here is the calling of the gentiles, and they are made equal in promise with Israel; and, if they despise this calling, they cannot lay the blame upon any body but themselves: at that day it will be said, *No law, no promise.*

THE MESSIAH'S KINGDOM IS NOT SPIRITUAL, BUT ABSOLUTELY EARTHLY.— In the last chapter of Ezekiel is described the inheritance of the Messiah. "And the residue shall be for the prince." "Moreover, from the possession of the Levites, and from the possession of the city, being in the midst of that which is the prince's." Ezek. xlviii. 21, 22. "And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all. And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have *one shepherd; they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my sta-

tutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children's children for ever; and my servant David shall be their prince for ever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore." Ezek. xxxvii. 22, 24—26. "And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them; I the Lord have spoken it." Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24. "Their children also shall be as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before me, and I will punish all that oppress them. And their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them." Jer. xxx. 20, 21. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots: and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord. But with righteousness shall he judge the poor. . . . And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious." Isa. xi. 1—4, 10.

"Behold the days come saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and * shall execute judgment and justice in the earth," *but not in heaven.* Jer. xxiii. 5. "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom which shall not be destroyed. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given * to the holy nation of the Most high, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Dan. vii. 14, 27. Here are sufficient proofs that the kingdom of the Messiah is not a spiritual kingdom; observe the term, "under the whole heaven."

* PROOF FROM THE GOSPEL THAT THE KINGDOM OF THE MESSIAH WAS NOT TO BE SPIRITUAL, BUT A KINGDOM OF THIS WORLD.—"When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye shall also sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Matt. xix. 28. Luke xxii. 30. Must not every body acknowledge that the kingdom of the Messiah is not spiritual, because here is to be set up * a throne for the Messiah, and then twelve more for the twelve apostles? this must be in this world, for we know that in heaven there is only one throne. Thus saith the Lord, "The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my foot-stool." Isaiah lxvi. 1. Secondly, here is mentioned eating and drinking; this must be in this world. Thirdly, in heaven not only Israel is judged but

all mankind; but here it is meant that the Messiah will be king over Israel only.

*THE LAW OF AN AMBASSADOR.—Supposing a king has any occasion to send an embassy to a foreign prince, or to a province; he will appoint some great man, chosen out of his subjects. *This ambassador will receive from his king a commission, every thing will be laid before him, and he will be directed to speak nothing but what he is ordered and commanded. The ambassador having departed and arrived in that foreign country, is it not his duty to go and discharge faithfully his commission? and, when he has done every thing proper, then he has done no more than his duty. But, suppose this ambassador when he arrived in that foreign country, instead of delivering his commission to the government, should go into the small towns and villages, and deliver his commission to the poor and ignorant, and at last should ask the ignorant, Will you acknowledge me as an ambassador, sent on purpose to you? Jesus did so; and the people said to him, We will not receive thee, for although thou hast proved something, yet we believe thee not; because, if thou art a true ambassador, thy duty was not to come to the poor, but to the king and his council, and to deliver unto them thy commission; but as thou hast acted the contrary, it is impossible that thy embassy can be true. Then he said, If ye will not receive me, I will go to another country, and deliver unto them my embassy. Then all the people *burst out a laughing, and cried out, Now we can see that thy commission is false; for when thou camest first to

us, thou didst declare unto us, that thou hadst received thy commission to no nation but to us, and now thou wilt go to another nation, with the same commission. Considering all these things, Jesus was taken, found guilty, and *was punished with a just punishment.

* *This was the case of the gentile Messiah.*—First, he said, he was sent to no nation, but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. What was his duty? *To go to king Herod, and before the Sanhedrin, and deliver unto them his commission, and tell them plainly that he was their Messiah, and was sent unto them. But he *never went to Jerusalem; *and why? because he had heard that John was cast into prison—on this account he departed into Galilee. Did he not testify that he was sent by God to Israel? *"For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak." John xii. 49. Did he fulfil his commission? no: for, instead of his going to Jerusalem, the proper place, he went to Galilee. But why was he afraid to go to Jerusalem? it was because John was in prison; and he was afraid that perhaps they would do the same to him. It is certainly marvellous that the Messiah, who was sent by God, should be afraid to deliver his commission.—We will follow him into Galilee, and see what he did there. "From that time Jesus began to preach, and went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and disease among the people." Matt. iv. 17. 23. "He said unto them, Let us go into

the next towns, that I may preach there also; for therefore came I forth. And he preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee and cast out devils." Mark i. 38, 39. "He said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent. And he preached in the synagogues of Galilee." Luke iv. 43, 44.—Let us see what effect his preaching, or his miracles had. "So the men sat down, in number about five thousand, with five barley loaves and two small fishes;" of this small dinner they all ate plenty, and yet afterwards the fragments that were left were twelve baskets over and above. The next day the people followed him to Capernaum; "and when they had found him on the other side, they said unto him, Rabbi, when camest thou hither? he answered them and said, Verily I say unto you, ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled. . . .Then they said unto him, What shall we do, that we may work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. They said therefore unto him, * What sign shewest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? what dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, he gave them bread from heaven to eat." John vi. 10, 13, 25, 26, 28—31.

If we consider the conduct of this number of people, we must certainly be surprised. They had all eaten yesterday a great dinner: they all saw that there was no more than five barley loaves and two small fishes, and yet more than enough for

five thousand people, and that it could not be done except by a miracle; and yet, the very next day, they said to him, "Give us a sign from heaven: our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat." Here you may see that all his miracles were considered by them as nothing, except he could shew them a miracle from heaven. On this account they mentioned the manna: but what is more wonderful than all, is this, that he * not even once gave them a sign from heaven, although they always were touching that string, and sounding that trumpet. We have already noticed that his commission was only to Israel; yet one thing we have passed over until now, and that is, to ask the question, *Was his commission only to preach, teach, heal the sick, and shew some miracles?*

It appears by his own words, that he was to do nothing but to preach and teach: "For therefore I am sent," he says: but I may say freely, that, * if this is true, then both the angel Gabriel and Zacharias the priest were liars. The angel Gabriel said, "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins." Mat. i. 21. And "the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, &c. And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke i. 26, 32, 33. From the words of the angel, we learn, that the Messiah was only intended for Israel, but not for the gentiles; he says, "For he shall save his people from their sins:" observe the term,

* *his people*; he shall save *them* from their sins; but no mention is here made of the gentiles:— That the Messiah shall be a king, but * not a preacher and teacher; for he says, "the Lord shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Israel for ever." Thus far is proved by the words of the angel, that the Messiah was not to go round about to preach, but to be a king over Israel, and sit upon a throne.

"And Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, Blessed be the God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people; and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets: that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; the oath which he sware to our father Abraham, that he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hands of our enemies might serve him without fear. To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins; whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us." Luke i. 67—74, 77, 78. From this prophecy we may learn, 1. That the redemption of Israel will be performed by the Messiah: mark the term, "For he hath visited and redeemed *his people*;" not a word about the gentiles: 2. "And he hath raised up a horn of salvation for *us*," but not for the gentiles, so says the text: 3. That he is to be a king, or "a horn;" it means one thing: 4. That he is to fight against all the enemies of Israel, and

to deliver them out of the hand of their enemies:" 5. That he will prosper, that Israel might be saved: 6. That all the good things are to be done to Israel, because it was "a promise to our fathers," also, on account of "his holy covenant:" 7. Besides the covenant and promise, there is an "oath, which God sware to Abraham," to do these things to his children at last; and at last, to take away their sins:—and "from on high he hath visited us;" mark, *visited us*.

Thus far it is clearly proved that the Messiah should not be a preacher, neither should he go round about in the towns, to teach and preach to the people. We must now admit that, if the words of Christ are true, then the words of the angel and Zacharias must be false; and again, if the words of the latter be true, then the words of Christ must be false. That both can be true, is impossible; therefore I thought it best to leave the whole matter to your consideration.

* CONCLUSION OF HIS EMBASSY.—After Jesus had walked round about in all parts of Galilee, preaching and teaching, and shewing miracles, hear what his own family say to him. "His brethren said unto him, Depart hence, and go into Judea, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world.—For neither did his brethren believe in him." John vii. 3—5. "The people answered and said, Thou hast a devil." John vii. 20. "Therefore I say unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation

bringing forth the fruits thereof." Matt. xxi. 43. —Hence you may learn, that his success was not better abroad than it was at home. At home he is blamed for doing his work in secret, and abroad he is called a devil. And he cried out, "Why go ye about to kill me?" and again he says, "The kingdom shall be taken, and given to another nation:" * well might the people cry out, Away with him, he is a bad man. First, when he came unto Galilee, he said, that he was sent only to Israel; now with the same commission he will go to another nation. He was taken and judged, and was found guilty, and he received due punishment.

* THE MESSIAH WAS TO BE CONQUEROR.—He will subdue all nations by his coming: and he who will be called the Messiah, and whoever is the true Messiah, will be able to perform and finish every thing: nay, without fighting he will never settle his kingdom; and this we shall here prove. "Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for the possession." Psalm ii. 8.

1. To obtain this large inheritance and possession, cannot be done except by fighting, as it is written, "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." Psalm ii. 9.

2. "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces." Daniel ii. 34.

3. "Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion: for I will make thine horn iron, and I will make thy hoofs brass, and thou shalt beat in pieces many

nations; and I will consecrate their gain unto the Lord, and their substance unto the Lord of the whole earth." Micah iv. 13.

4. "That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us." Luke i. 71.

5. "The Lord of Hosts shall defend them; and they shall devour and subdue with sling stones; and they shall drink and make a noise as through wine; and they shall be filled like bowls, and as the corners of the altar." Zech. ix. 15.

6. "In that day will I make the governors of Judah like a hearth of fire among the wood, and like a torch of fire in a sheaf; and they shall devour all the nations round about, on the right hand and on the left; and Jerusalem shall be inhabited again in her own place, even in Jerusalem." Zech. xii. 6.

Although the king, Messiah, with his people Israel, shall fight all nations, yet the victory will not be their's, but the Lord's, for so it is written.

1. "Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against the nations, as when he fought in the day of battle." Zech. xiv. 3. "The Lord is a man of war." Exod. xv. 3.

2. "The Lord shall go forth as a mighty man; he shall stir up jealousy like a man of war; he shall cry, yea, roar, he shall prevail against his enemies." Isaih xlii. 13.

Perhaps the gentiles will say, We never shall go and fight against the Messiah. This is not true, for when he shall come they shall not believe him to be the Messiah: although they will see wonders in heaven and on earth, yet shall they not believe him: and so it is written, "The kings of the earth

shall set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed." Psalm ii. 2.

3. *The gentiles are challenged to a battle.* "Proclaim ye this among the gentiles; prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up." Joel iii. 9.—*The challenge is accepted.* Now also many nations are gathered against thee, that say, Let her be defiled, and let our eye look, &c. Micah iv. 11. And all the nations shall be gathered together against Jerusalem. Zech. xii. 3.—*Jerusalem shall be taken by the gentiles.* "For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city." Zech. xiv. 2. This will be the last battle in this world; and after this battle shall the kingdom of the Messiah be established, from one end of the world to the other end.

Thus far it is clearly proved that the kingdom of the Messiah cannot be established until he first fight against the gentiles. This will be his commission to appear like a mighty king, and subdue all; but he will not be a preacher.

* A PARTICULAR OBSERVATION CONCERNING THE LAW OF MOSES. Every man knows that whatever has a beginning has also an end. We know that man was formed of dust, and unto it he must return. The nature of man is changeable in all his actions; to-day he is bad, to-morrow he is good; to-day he is good, and to-morrow he is bad; to-day he says Yes, and to-morrow he says No; to-day he says

No, and to-morrow he says Yes; to-day he says I will, but to-morrow, I will not; what he had spoken yesterday, to-day he has already forgotten; what he shall speak to-morrow, he knows not; nay, the very minute before, he knows not what he shall speak. But we know this, that there is only one that has no beginning and no end, and this is God: no man will contradict me when I say, that every word that God intended to speak to man was known to him from everlasting: he, by his Godly wisdom, * prepared to himself a drawing by which he was to build this world; in this drawing were specified, the length and breadth of it; and there was an appointed time for every thing, when to begin and when to end: every nation that was to appear afterwards, was called by its name; and a great number of particular men were called by their name beforehand; yea, every man that was to be born was known unto him. In this drawing were also described particular rivers and their names, particular mountains and their names, deserts and their names, cities and their names: in this drawing is also to be found how long this world shall exist; also the good and bad fortune of every nation: this drawing is commonly known by the name of *the law of Moses*. He, by his Godly wisdom, prepared also subdrawings; but all of them are only the channels of the former: these subdrawings are commonly known by the name of the *prophets*. In due time, when he thought proper by his Godly wisdom to create this world, every thing appeared according as it was described in this great drawing.

* ABRIDGMENT OF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS.

—We find in this drawing that in six days the world was created. We ask, Why just six days, neither more nor less? We also believe that he who created this world in six days could have done it in one day, in one hour, nay, in one minute: here we must acknowledge that it was intended to represent something. One reason is this, to shew that * the number of six is a complete number, which is to denote the four quarters of this world, heaven above, and the earth beneath: these six points include the whole description of the drawing, and the Lord over the whole of this great fabric is only one. This point will be handled more in the following pages. Secondly, that each day is to represent a thousand years; that is, that this world shall exist for the space of six thousand years. The seventh day, which is called the sabbath, represented, that after six thousand years there shall be a sabbatical time for a thousand years.

The creation of man was the last. * His name was called Adam: in the original this name consists only of three letters viz. אדם ADM. In this name is represented the beginning of the world, also the centre, and the end. The letter A denotes Adam, the letter D is David, the M is the Messiah.

* In the year of the creation 2854, David was born; and so long as it is from Adam to David, * even so long, or near it, will be the time of the coming of the Messiah; but never before. By this account it appears, that the time of the appearance of the Messiah is near at hand; for, if we add 2854, then the coming of the Messiah will be in the year of the creation 5708. This present year we count 5571: and here we find that there

are yet 137 years to the time of his coming: but we know that this time will be shortened; and according to the opinion of one great and eminent Rabbi, there are only 29 years more to the time of his coming, and when we shall begin to count 5600 all things in this world will be settled.

Thus far goes our observation on this grand point, that Adam was in the beginning, and David in the middle, and the Messiah near the end.

Further, it ought to be observed, that it cannot be said to shorten the beginning, neither can the centre be shortened, * but the end of any thing may be shortened.

* We also know that Christ was born 910 years after David. This short number will not balance the length of 6000 years: here we shall draw a line of 6000 cubits, A——D——M. From the letter A to the letter D, is the half or the middle, and from D to M must be the same distance. A and D cannot be shortened, but the M, as it is the end, may be shortened: but if we consider the coming of Christ, the letter M will be a long way from the end. And here again we will bring the length of this word A——D—M—; thus far only can be brought the distance between David and Christ, and 910 years are no more than a third part of 2854; and, if we only consider well, it must be an equal distance in these three letters ADM: as to the rest I leave it to you to finish.

* THE PLACING OF ADAM IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN. —Adam and Eve were placed in Paradise; his glory was above an angel; the same his wisdom; * no angel could call names of all living creatures; but Adam could, and whatever he called them so

remained their names until this day. Here Adam enjoyed the blessing of a blessed world; he knew not what sin was; he was made pure, and so he continued until Satan (who was at that time a great angel,) became jealous of the glory of Adam, and was determined to bring him down: down he came with his band; he succeeded; the man fell; Adam, Eve, Satan, all three were found guilty: Satan was cast out; Adam and Eve were driven out: before they left paradise, the Lord made a promise to the man, saying, Near the end of 6000 years thy glory shall be restored unto thee; but thou, O Satan, at that very time thou shalt be destroyed; as it is written, "He will swallow up death for ever." Isaiah xxv. 8.

The Lord said to Satan, Thou hast deceived the man, and thou Adam, thou hast followed his advice; get you both out, march away together, fight it out, and he who shall overcome Satan, him will I make great in the last day. Paradise was shut up, and cherubims were placed at the east of the garden to keep the way of the tree of life. Here ended the first world, and now we shall go to the *second world.*

Adam began to wander, and Satan at his heels; Eve brought forth Cain and Abel; Satan was bent to make the best use of his profession; he observed that two new men appeared in the world; he immediately went to work, and succeeded again; he helped Cain to slay his innocent brother Abel.

There passed away 1656 years, that is from Adam until Noah; few were those men that * overcame Satan, and at last he destroyed the whole world,

except Noah and his family that were saved. Thus far we have read in the great drawings, *intermixed with a few traditions.*

FROM THE FLOOD UNTIL THE BUILDING OF THE TOWER OF BABYLON.—After the flood, the Lord said to Noah and his family, From hence and further ye may eat flesh. The Lord also gave them a short law, which consisted only of seven commandments.

* THE LAW OF NOAH.—1. Not to commit idolatry. 2. Not to blaspheme. 3. To appoint and constitute just and upright judges, that justice might be maintained, and impartially administered to all. 4. Not to commit incest. 5. Not to commit murder. 6. Not to rob or steal. 7. Not to eat a member of a living creature.

These seven commandments are the law given to Noah and his family, to keep and observe them, from that time and further; and every one that is not of Israel is bound to keep this short law, and every one that observes them is entitled to happiness.

THE BUILDING OF THE TOWER. The children of Shem, Ham, and Japhet were seventy families: after they were scattered each of them became a nation. * There is a tradition, that of these seventy families twenty-nine were destroyed by a flood, and no more remained than forty-one. Afterwards the number of seventy nations was again completed by the children of Keturah, who were twelve families, and sixteen of Ishmael and Edom.

PROOF THAT THERE WERE NO MORE THAN SEVENTY NATIONS.—1. In page 50, it is already mentioned, that as many as went into Egypt with Jacob, (which were 70 in number,) so many na-

tions there were to be in the whole world, and no more. "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel." Deut. xxxii. 8.

2. "In the fifteenth day of the seventh month," i. e. Tishri, or Ethonim, "ye shall offer unto the Lord thirteen young bullocks. The second day twelve bullocks: the third day ye shall offer eleven bullocks: on the fourth day ten bullocks: on the fifth day nine bullocks: on the sixth day eight bullocks: and on the seventh day seven bullocks." Numbers xxix. 12, 13, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32. These offerings were offered at the feast of Tabernacles for all the seventy nations, and here you find also the number of seventy bullocks.—"But on the eighth day ye shall have a solemn assembly: ye shall do no servile work therein; and ye shall offer only one bullock." ver. 35. Here we observe, when Israel hath finished the offering for all nations, then they were commanded to offer only one bullock for all Israel. All these things we find in the great drawing, or properly, the law.

* ABRAHAM AND HIS FAMILY.—Next we find recorded in the drawing, that a man by the name of Abraham was to appear in this world, and that he should be the favourite of God, and above all men; and so it came to pass.—Next is recorded, that God will make a covenant with this man, and that he and his seed after him were chosen to be his peculiar people, not for a time, but for ever; not Ishmael, nor the sons of Keturah, neither

Edom; for so it is recorded in the drawing; "For thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special nation unto himself, above all nations that are upon the face of the earth." Deut. vii. 6. In a subdrawing it is also mentioned, "O ye seed of Abraham his servant, ye children of Jacob his chosen." Psalm cv. 6.—Next we find that the seed of Abraham was to be in bondage in a strange land four hundred years, and after that he would give them a land, and so it came to pass. We also find that his children, when they were only seventy in number, went down into Egypt. Their father Jacob went with them. The good father Jacob fell ill; he assembled his twelve sons to give them his blessing before his departure from this world; he blessed every one, but one of his sons he made Lord over all his brethren, which was Judah. The foundation of all their blessing is depending on one single verse. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the nations be." Gen. xlix. 10.

The gentiles have laid hold on this passage: they say that this passage is a proof that the Messiah is come already, because the sceptre is departed from Judah:" * but I say, they are mistaken, and here is the proof. "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession." Genesis xvii. 8. "And I will perform the oath which I swore unto Abraham, thy father." Genesis xxvi. 3. "And I will give this land to thy

seed after thee, for an everlasting possession.". Gen. xlviii. 4. The gentiles here do not only contradict Abraham and Isaac, but also Jacob. In one place, Jacob says, the land is given to his seed for ever; and in the next, he says, the sceptre is to depart: both of them cannot be true.

Here I may ask this question of a learned man of the gentiles; the Lord promised the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and you will say the sceptre departed from Judah: can these two questions be true or not; You will say, they must be both true, because they are the word of God: but the question will be, how will you reconcile these two passages? You have no other way to reconcile them, except you say the land was promised conditionally; and if you say so, you speak the truth, for so it was conditionally. The condition was, that Israel shall have the land, but they must observe the law of God: but Israel did not observe; the land was again taken away from them, now 1746 years.

THE LAND OF CANAAN CONDITIONALLY.—"Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them: that the land whither I bring you to dwell therein, spew you not out. Levit. xx. 22. "The Lord shall bring thee, and thy king which thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, &c. If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book." Deut. xxviii. 36, 58. Here you may learn that to have the land of Canaan always depended on the law. And next you may observe, that the sceptre is the land, and the land is the sceptre; for, so long as

any nation has a country of their own, they also have a sceptre; but, when their country is taken away, both of them must be lost together. And, lastly, it cannot here be said that the Messiah is come because the sceptre has departed from Judah: for here it is already proved, that the land and sceptre were conditionally given; and therefore the land and sceptre were taken away when Israel did not observe the law; and, if there is no law, there is no land nor sceptre. And by this proof it is clearly shewn that the Messiah is not yet come.

* THE TRUE EXPLANATION OF THIS PROPHECY. —Jacob said to his sons, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah;" that is, the king over all Israel shall be always out of the tribe of Judah, and as long as Israel shall obey the law, the sceptre shall remain in the nation, even until Shiloh come; which is to say, although the king over Israel should have no power over any other nation, yet Israel shall remain always a nation, and be governed by their own king, even until Shiloh come; and, when Shiloh shall come, then he will not be king over Israel only, but over all nations. But, if Israel will not keep the law, then the land will be taken away from them, then they will have no land, nor a king; but its departure shall not be for ever, for there is an appointed time for Shiloh, when he is to come, and then * the kingdom shall be restored to Israel, and all these words recorded here shall come to pass.

In one of the sub-drawings, 2 Kings xxv, we are told that the king and people, and the land, fell together, and both king and people went together into captivity; and in the same manner

as they went out into captivity, even in the same manner they will return; and this we can prove, that when Shiloh shall come he shall not come alone by himself, but in the head of all Israel: and so it is written in another of the sub-drawings, "The breaker is come up before them · they have broken up, and have passed through the gate, and are gone out by it: and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them." Micah ii. 13.

*THE ARGUMENT OF THE GENTILES THAT THE SCEPTRE HAS DEPARTED FROM JUDAH—considering that Shiloh is come already. Take notice what I shall say here: they say that Jesus was the son of David, and that he was Shiloh; the question will be, when did the sceptre depart? If he was king over Israel, then the sceptre never departed, nay not even one day, for he was king of Judah, and the son of David, and in the nation of Israel, and in the land of Canaan: is not this a clear proof that the sceptre never departed?

Here the reader will be surprised to see that the whole of their argument is merely nothing; for, if they say it is departed, it is false, and they only contradict themselves; because, according to their own statement, it has never departed yet; but if they say it is not departed, even this cannot be true, because the whole world know it is departed?

QUESTION. WAS ABRAHAM IGNORANT OF THE COMING OF SHILOH?—What Jacob knew, Isaac knew; and Abraham also knew that Shiloh was to come. It is recorded in the drawing in Genesis xiv, that war will commence among the sons of Adam, and so it came to pass.

THE BATTLE OF THE FOUR KINGS WITH ABRAHAM.—When these four kings had taken Lot prisoner, Abraham took his servants, which were in number three hundred and eighteen, and with this little army he pursued them, conquered all the four kings, and recovered his brother's son Lot, and all his fortune.

A little while after this, the Lord appeared to Abraham in a vision, saying, "Fear not, Abraham; I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward:" here a son was promised to him, and also the land of Canaan. Further the Lord said unto him, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."

Abraham was informed also that his seed should be in bondage four hundred years, in a land that was not their's, and afterwards they should be called the chosen people of God. Also that there should arise four empires, and they should have the dominion over this world, and that the seed of Abraham should be scattered among them, and that these four empires should have the dominion over the seed of Abraham, until Shiloh should come.

*THE FOUR EMPIRES WERE SHEWN TO ABRAHAM. And he said to Abraham, "Take a heifer, of three years old, and a she-goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon: and he divided them in the midst, but the birds divided he not. And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abraham; and, lo, a horror of great dark-

ness fell upon him.". Gen. xv. 9. 12. * In the shape of a heifer Abraham saw Babylon: in the shape of a she-goat he saw Persia and Media: in the shape of a ram he saw Alexander the Great: in the shape of a turtle he saw the Romans: in the shape of a bird he saw his family of Israel.

When Abraham observed the miserable state of his family, their long captivity, their great sufferings under the power of these four empires, he thought to himself, how is it possible for them to bear so long a captivity? But, when he saw that it must be so, he took them and cut each of them into two pieces, and laid one piece against the other. The further to relieve, in some measure, his family, he divided them, that is, he weakened their strength and power, by setting each piece against the other: that these four empires should be always one against the other, and they never should be quiet, but always fighting the one against the other: by so doing the gentiles will fight one against the other, they now and then will forget Israel, and sometimes they will have no time to meditate against them; this will, in some degree, save them from utter destruction. But did Abraham despair of his family to remain in that miserable state for ever? No, by no means, for Abraham was comforted by his God by a great promise. The Lord said to Abraham, I have given thee a token already, that as well as I have cast down before thee four kings, even so will I do to thy seed in due time; and as well as these four empires now fell before thee, even their seed that shall be the four empires in the latter days again shall also fall by thy son Shiloh. Thus far

we have found notified in the great drawing, which was ordained and established before the world was created.

Now we must look into the drawing again. Here we have found and discovered the name of the family of Abraham. "Come now, therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt:" Exod. iii. 10: "And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my *first born son.*" Exod. iv. 22. * Although God made a covenant with Abraham, and with his seed for ever, it was still unknown to the world at large; no nation knew who was to be called the first born, but it was now declared to the gentiles by Moses: "And thou shalt say to Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, *Israel is my first born son.*"

Suppose a king has a numerous family; will not every one declare that out of the whole family, only one son can be declared the heir to the crown? will not also every man confess that the first born son is the lawful heir? to which will the king give most instruction? certainly to the first born. To which of his family will he communicate all his secrets? to his first born. To which of his sons will he deliver his great seal? to his first born. Thus far it must be acknowledged by every person that only the first born son has a right to the kingdom of his father; but the rest of the family must remain in subjection, and they all must acknowledge him as their lord and king. But the inhabitants of the whole empire must remain to day the same as

they were yesterday; yesterday they were servants, and to day they must be the same; and so they must remain always.

*QUESTION: IS THE FIRST BORN SON BORN FOR OTHERS, OR ARE THE PUBLIC AT LARGE BORN FOR HIM?—Here you must say that his birth made him lord over all, not to obey, but to be obeyed; not to be commanded, but to command; not to be judged, but to judge; not to be equal, but to be above all. Considering all these things, the subjects of the king are by no means born for themselves, but all of them are born to be his servants and to obey his orders as their lord and king. This king is the God of heaven and earth; all the sons of Adam are his subjects; they all are bound to obey him, and to worship him, and honour his great name, and to obey his command. Now it pleased him to declare, that Israel is the prince of this world; he delivered to Israel *his great seal, that is, circumcision; he communicated to Israel all his secrets, that is the oracles of God; and saith unto Israel, "Ye are the sons of the Lord your God." Deut. xiv. 1. And that all the families of this world should know that Israel was elected and chosen, the Lord gave them his own name, specified in their name. *The noun ישראל, *Israel*, consists of two words: the first ישר, yoshor, signifies *righteous*; the second word אל, El, signifies *God*; and both words together are pronounced *Israel*, and signify *the righteous of God*. This name is the crown and glory of Israel, and further the gentile world should or ought to consider, *that to Israel was delivered the great seal of circumcision, and the

oracles, and the crown. All these things we find recorded in the great drawing of the law, which was prepared before the foundation of this world; and here all the nations may see, and learn, and be convinced, * that Israel was chosen and elected before the creation of this world, to be the Lord and king over it: and here all nations witness, that from the time that circumcision was delivered to Abraham it never ceased; and this very day it is observed just the same; and the oracles are observed just the same; and also the name Israel, declared by Moses, three thousand one hundred years back; and to-day Israel is still Israel: and thus having in possession these three great gifts is a sufficient proof this very day that Israel was elected, and shall so remain for ever. * It is a vain thing for the gentiles to grasp at the kingdom of this world; they are not called the sons; and they well know, that a servant or servants have nothing else to do but to obey the order of their lord and master. All that is said here, if considered by the gentiles, I should like to know their answer: yet I can well imagine it; 'For if Israel is the Lord of this world, where is then his glory? but we can prove on the contrary, that the gentiles are the lords of the world, and Israel are their servants even until this day.' To this I answer, that the wise God did ordain every thing according to his wisdom; he created the first man pure and godly, and so he was, but the man fell. From the creation of Adam until he fell, must be called the *godly world.* Now this godly world ended when Adam was driven out from paradise. The second world commenced, and its proper

name is *the world of corruption:* but in this fallen state it is not to remain for ever; the time is fixed, six thousand years is its number, and after this is the end: then the world will recover its former glory and be restored by the Messiah; and then will commence the fifth empire in this world, and its power will extend from one end of this world to the other. The beginning of this fifth empire will be called the *third world,* or the *godly world,* or properly *the world of the Messiah.* His metropolis will be Jerusalem, and Israel his people: but, before these things will take place, the world will stand and be conducted by the gentiles; Israel is only to wander round about amongst them, and the present feasting belongs only to the gentiles. Israel has no right, because the feast goes by turn: when the gentiles shall finish their feast, then will commence the feasting of Israel, and until the appointed day Israel must not rejoice; for so it is described in one of the subdrawings, "Rejoice not, O Israel, in the joy of the nations." Hosea ix. 1. "Then," that is, when the Messiah shall come, "shall our mouth be filled with joy, and our tongue with singing: then the nations shall say, The Lord hath done great things for them." Psalm cxxvi. 2, 3. The Lord hath done great things for us in past times; then we were rejoicing, but now Israel is rejoicing.

Thus far it is described that this world from its beginning is to be divided into three divisions; the first, godly; the second, corrupt; and the third again to be restored to its former glory.

*THE WILDERNESS.—One question we may ask,

which is, Why was the law given in a desert? Why not in the land of Israel? The answer is, that, although the law is the inheritance of Israel, yet any nation, if they choose, may claim a right to it, and say the law is given in a free place, and every one that will have a share of it must be accepted: and on this account the law is given in a desert, which is a free place to every one, even so the law is free to every one who will come under her protection, and Israel is bound to accept any of the nations.

* THE SABBATH.—Next we find in the drawing, that the Lord himself spoke to the whole nation of Israel, and said to them, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy." Exod. xx. 8. Here Israel was commanded to keep this day holy, in commemoration of the creation of the world; also in commemoration of the coming out of the land of Egypt. "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Deut. v. 15.

* Every person knows that the days of the creation are seven: the first and second day are one pair; the third and fourth are again a pair; the fifth and sixth a third pair; the Sabbath remained single. This last day received a blessing, but not the former days: although the Sabbath was the last, yet it was made lord over the other days, because the world was not complete until the Sabbath came, and then the world was completely finished. It is already mentioned

in pages 50 and 69, that this world was to produce seventy nations; in this number we also find thirty-five pair, but there was no pair for Israel. When Jacob and his family went down into Egypt, at that very time the seventy nations appeared in this world already. Israel was the last nation in this world.

*THE WORLD COMPARED TO A SHIP WITHOUT A RUDDER.—That is, although the ship is finished, yet still it must be considered of no use without a rudder; for it is well known that the rudder is the only piece by which the whole ship is steered. Just the same was the condition of the seventy nations; but when Israel was formed a nation they completed the world to its full number: now the world was completed in creation and in number; Israel was the rudder of the ship, and for the first time they brought the whole ship in motion. Still the ship was not yet able to steer without danger for want of a compass; and that the ship should be entirely complete in every direction a compass was also given. *This compass was the law of Moses: the Lord himself taught all Israel the foundation of it, which was the ten commandments. The Lord said, Ye are the last of all nations, by you my world is finished, and you shall be the first and lord over all the rest, as it is written; "And to make thee high above all nations which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; that thou mayest be a holy nation unto the Lord thy God, as he hath spoken." Deut. xxvi. 19. At the same time Israel stood single: then the Lord said, The last day of the creation I have blessed, and made it

lord over the rest; ye also are the last of all nations, and I have blessed you already; *come then and be ye two, a blessed pair together, and thus ye shall remain a couple for ever: and here the whole world will confess, that from that time until this day Israel has never forsaken his pair. Thus far it is shewn, that before the world was created Israel and the Sabbath was to be a pair; also all the feasts shall be called Sabbaths, for so we find it in the great drawing. One feast is the Passover, also called Sabbath; "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath." The second feast is the Pentecost, also called Sabbath; "Even unto the morrow after the seventh." Next comes the new year, also called Sabbath; "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a Sabbath." Next comes the tenth day, or the day of atonement, also called Sabbath; "It shall be unto you a Sabbath." Next comes the feast of Tabernacles, also called Sabbath; "On the first day shall be a Sabbath." Levit. xxiii. 15, 16, 20, 32, 39. After all that has been said, here is a proof that before the world was created Israel and the Sabbath were blessed, and coupled together to be a pair for ever, and to be lords over all the things which God created. The first Sabbath was also a type of the great Sabbath, and known by the name of *_Millennium_, and properly means the reign of the Messiah upon earth.

*THE OPINION OF THE GENTILES CONCERNING THE SABBATH.—If I say to one of the gentiles, What do you think about the law of Moses? he will answer me thus, The law is abolished. Then

if I ask him, The whole of it, or only part? he then will say, I am a gentile; we are bound to observe only the moral law, which is the ten commandments. Then I say, answer this question; Is not the Sabbath one of the ten commandments? then he will answer me thus; I, as a gentile, keep the first day, and that is my proper Sabbath.

This observation wants consideration: every one knows that the first day is called a working day, and the Lord of heaven and earth made it, and began on it to work; the question will be, who is he that will stand up and contradict the Lord over all? he said, The first day shall be a labouring day, and somebody got up and said, I say the contrary, it shall be called the Sabbath. Now the question is, who is the person that will dare to call *holy* that which the Lord called *unholy*? it cannot be said that the gentile Messiah commanded it: do Christians derive it from what Paul said? "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store." 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

Here the question will be, are men to obey the command of God, or the command of the apostle Paul? It is already noticed * that the Sabbath is a type of the Millenium, but what is the first day to typify? Now, according to the law, the gentiles have nothing else to do but observe the law of Noah, already mentioned in page 69; they have * no right to keep holy that which is not holy, but, if any one will keep a Sabbath, he must then keep the Sabbath of the Lord. It is also mentioned in page 83, that all the feasts are called

Sabbaths: then it will follow that he who will be an observer of the Sabbath must observe also all the feasts and must keep the whole law. But we see that the gentiles act contrary to the will of God, they will have a Sabbath on a working day; and here it may be asserted that the Millennium will be only for those who observe the Sabbath; as for the gentiles, they shall work then on the Sabbath, even as they do now.

*THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.—"And this shall be a statute for ever unto you, that in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and do no work at all, whether it be one of your own country or the stranger that sojourneth among you: for on that day the priest makes an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord: it shall be a Sabbath of rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls, by a statute for ever; and this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year." Lev. xvi. 29, 30, 31. 34.

In page 47 it is mentioned, that Moses was convinced that Israel would be dispersed among the gentiles, and therefore he gave them direction how to steer, that they might recover their ancient glory: he never told them to sacrifice any thing in their dispersion, but informed them that they had nothing else to do, but to return unto the Lord by true repentance, and then the Lord would restore them. But here the Jew will ask the question, Are we left destitute in our dispersion of a tabernacle, or of a temple, or of sacrifices?

No, for even this very day we have a temple, and we have also sacrifices. "Therefore say, Thus saith the Lord God; Although I have cast them far off among the heathen, and although I have scattered them among the countries, yet will I be to them as *a little sanctuary in the countries where they shall come." Ezek. xi. 16. Here you see that our Synagogues are still the temples of the Lord.

*Sacrifices.—"The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit." Psalm li. 17. "O, Israel! return unto the Lord thy God; for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity. Take with you words, and turn to the Lord; say unto him, Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously; so will we render the calves of our lips." Hosea xiv. 1, 2. *Now, when the day of atonement comes, we all go into our little sanctuary; there we continue the whole day, we fast the whole day, the whole day is spent in prayers. Thus we are ordered to do, and so we do year by year; and here is the forgiveness of all the sins of Israel once a year. Thus far is shewn to the gentiles, that Israel has this very day a temple, also sacrifices. The gentiles, perhaps, will say, if so, why is then Israel not restored to her former glory?

Take notice of what follows: It is already mentioned in page 67 that the proper Messiah will come in due time; and in page 69 it is stated that there were to be in this world *only seventy nations. These seventy nations were formed at the building of the tower of Babylon. At that time Abraham was forty-eight years old. From that time until *the Lord made a covenant

with Abraham were twenty-two years; thus was *Abraham seventy years old. Here Abraham represents the seventy of his family that afterwards went down into Egypt, see page 69; "And the Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel." Num. xi. 16. This number remained in Israel until the second temple was destroyed. These seventy were the first Sanhedrin, and Moses the Lord over them, the same as the Sanhedrin above; the seventy angels that stand in the presence of the Lord are called the heavenly Sanhedrin.

At that time, when the sons of Adam had one language only, they began to be rebellious. The Lord said to his Sanhedrin, "Let us go down, and there confound their language;" the seventy families shall be divided by lot: and thus every angel became a guardian angel to that family, which was afterwards a nation. Abraham fell to the lot of God, as it is written, "For the Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance." Deut. xxxii. 9. But here it should be known, that the lot of God was as much in number as that of all his seventy Sanhedrin, for so it is written, Deut. xxxii. 8: see page 50. And * that every nation has a prince in heaven, is confirmed by the prophet: "And now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth lo, the prince of Grecia shall come." Daniel x. 20.

David, the father of the Messiah, lived only *seventy* years.

The captivity of Babylon was *seventy* years.

From the birth of David, until the desolation of the temple of Solomon was *seventy* weeks.

*From the destruction of the first temple to the destruction of the second temple, was also *seventy* weeks. Daniel ix. 24.

It ought to be observed that this number of *seventy*, so much made use of, is not a vain thing; but it will instruct us to understand that the sons of Noah, only divided into seventy nations, should represent *seventy jubilees*; that is, from the time of the covenant, made with Abraham, until the coming of the Messiah, and in the end of this number shall commence the Jubilee of Israel.

These *seventy jubilees* are to be divided into two divisions: the commencement of the first half, or thirty-five, began by the covenant, and ended by the desolation of the second temple.

	Years.
*ACCOUNT.—From the covenant until the law	430
Israel had the land in possession only .	850
From the desolation of the first to the end of the second temple . . .	490
N. B. This number will amount to thirty-five jubilees, and twenty years. Total	1770
From the desolation of the second temple, until this present year (1812) is the number of	1745

This last number, of the dispersion of Israel, is just now thirty-five jubilees. Both sums will amount to 3520 years, or the sum of *seventy jubilees*, and above twenty years.

*By this calculation, we may learn, that the jubilee of the restoration of Israel has begun already these twenty years back, that is, just when the revolution began in France; at that very

time, the seventy jubilees were at an end. There are yet thirty-six years to the end of the jubilee of Israel, AND BEFORE THE END OF THESE THIRTY-SIX YEARS ISRAEL WILL BE RESTORED, AND THE MESSIAH WILL TAKE POSSESSION OF HIS EMPIRE.

* ISRAEL IS SEPARATED FOR EVER FROM ALL NATIONS.—" I am the Lord your God, which have separated you from other nations; and ye shall be holy unto me, for I the Lord am holy, and have severed you from the nations, that ye should be mine." Lev. xx. 24, 26. " For, from the top of the rocks I see him, and from the hills I behold him: lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." Numbers xxiii. 9. " For all the nations will walk every one in the name of his God, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God, for ever and ever." Micah iv. 5.

Whoever considers these passages, may see, first, that Israel will never be mixed with the gentiles; and, secondly, * that all the gentiles will not worship the true God even until the last day.

* MOSES FORETOLD OF THE COMING OF THE GENTILE MESSIAH.—Christians adduce this prophecy: " I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth: and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Deut. xiv. 18. We read in the same book, " And there arose not a prophet since in Israel, like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face." Deut. xxxiv. 10.

The Christians say that their Messiah was superior to Moses: but how will they reconcile

these two passages? for they say the first passage means their Messiah. *But what will they do with the second passage, which is, that there will never be another prophet equal to Moses. Further, this prophet is not to speak with God face to face; for here *the text says, "I will put my words in his mouth:" that is, he shall prophesy by a vision, or in a dream. *Again, what honour is this for the Messiah to be styled a prophet, for the honour of the high priest goes before a prophet, as we find it written: "And King David said, Call me Zadok the priest, and Nathan the prophet. And let Zadok the priest, and Nathan the prophet, anoint him there king over Israel." 1 Kings i. 32, 34. Here it may be seen that the title of high priest is above that of a prophet: next is to be known that the Messiah is no where styled a prophet, but either a judge, or a ruler, or a king; also that, *when the Messiah shall come, he will have nothing to prophesy, because his coming will accomplish all the prophecies.

But after all we ask, Was Jesus a prophet or not? If he was a prophet, we must examine what he prophesied.

* PROPHECIES OF JESUS.—The destruction of the temple is foretold in Matthew xxiv. "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the gentiles, until the times of the gentiles be fulfilled." Luke xxi. 24. What shall I say here? is it possible for mankind to call these passages prophecies? They may lawfully be called quotations from the prophets: and here I shall bring forward sufficient evidence

to shew that these prophecies are no more than quotations from the writings of the Old Testament. Jesus says, "Verily I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another." Mark xxiv. 2. *We shall go backward as far as to David, and inquire of him if he knew any thing about the fate of the first or second temple. "By the river of Babylon, there we sat down; yea, we wept when we remembered Zion." Psalm cxxxvii. 1. Here is the destruction of the first temple. "Remember, O Lord, the children of Edom in the day of Jerusalem, who said, Rase it, rase it, even to the foundation thereof." Psalm cxxxvii. 7. Here is the desolation of the second temple by Edom. Thus far we have produced one faithful witness, to shew that Christ was no prophet; but his words are only taken from this Psalm.

Seventy weeks are four hundred and ninety years, that is, from the destruction of the first temple to the desolation of the second shall be no more than four hundred and ninety. Dan. ix. 24.

"Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars." Zech. xi. 1. "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led captive into all nations." Luke xxi. 24. This passage also is no more than a quotation. "Therefore he lifted up his hand against them, to overthrow them in the wilderness:" to overthrow. Psalm cvi. 26, 27. Also, "And will draw out a sword after you:" their seed also among the nations, and to scatter them in the lands. Leviticus xxvi. 33. "The Lord doth build up Jerusalem: the outcasts of Israel he shall gather." Psalm cxlvii. 2. "I lifted up mine hand unto them also

in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the heathen, and disperse them through the countries." Ezekiel xx. 23. "For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve; yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth." Amos ix. 9.

ANOTHER GREAT PROPHECY OF JESUS.—"Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." Matthew xxiv. 34. Until this day now above 1800 years, this passage is not yet fulfilled; whereas he fixed the time to his generation: and in the same manner may be refuted all the rest of his prophecies; but I think the above proofs are sufficient to convince the reader that he was no prophet.—But the true sense of this prophecy shall be here given, that by it it will be known that it has no reference at all to the Messiah.

I WILL RAISE THEM UP A PROPHET.—"When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord: and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee. Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God. For these nations, which thou shalt possess, hearken unto observers of

times, and unto diviners: but, as for thee, the Lord thy God hath not suffered thee so to do. The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee *a prophet* from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." Deut. xviii. 9—15. Thus far Moses taught Israel, that when they should inherit the land they must not learn the abominations of the gentiles, for you shall have no occasion; because the Lord your God, will always raise for you prophets from the midst of you; therefore any thing what thou shalt wish to know, thou shalt go to him and he shall tell thee.

Perhaps some person will ask, why is it then in the singular number, a *prophet*, and not *prophets*?

It is well known that we have two laws: the one is called the *written* law, which is the Old Testament; the second is called * the *oral* law, and * both of these Moses received upon Mount Sinai. This oral law was always delivered to the successor of the first; Moses received of God, Joshua of Moses.

From Joshua to Samuel the prophet were twelve judges, and every one of these twelve was a receiver of the oral law; this receiver was called also the Nassi, or president of his Sanhedrin; Joshua delivered the oral law to Othniel, the son of Kenaz; and the last of these twelve was Eli, the high priest.

The first of the prophets that received the oral law was Samuel, he received it of Eli the high priest. 2. Nathan the prophet. 3. Ahijah the Shilonite. 4. Elijah the Tishbite. 5. Elisha the son of Shaphat. 6. Hosea the son of Beeri. 7. Amos a herdman of Tekoa. 8. Isaiah the son

of Amoz. 9. Micah the Morasthite. 10. Joel the son of Pethuel. 11. Jeremiah the son of Hilkiah. 12. Ezekiel the son of Buzi the priest.

Thus far goes the account of those Prophets that received the oral law, in the time of the FIRST TEMPLE.

Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; these three prophets were in the time of the SECOND TEMPLE. Malachi was the last of all the prophets, and he is also *the great seal of the Old Testament; and from this we learn that there shall be no more a prophet in Israel until the restoration of Israel, "Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." Mal. iv. 5.—Next will be shewn, that in the time of every prophet that received the oral law were many prophets, but all of them were called only the disciples of him who was the receiver; and he was the Lord over them all, the same as Moses was over his Sanhedrin; and *each receiver was as God in his age, as Moses in his age. When Samuel anointed Saul he said unto him, "Thou shalt meet a company of prophets." 1 Sam. x. 5. "And the sons of the prophets." 2 Kings ii. 3. "What, shall I set this before a hundred men?" 2 Kings iv. 43. these were his disciples.

It is well known that Moses was the lord of all the prophets, and *the seventy elders, or his Sanhedrin, were all prophets; yet not one of them is mentioned, but *only Moses. What Moses desired of God, it was granted; what Samuel desired of God, it was granted; what Elijah desired of God, it was granted; what Elisha desired of God, it was granted; and in

the same manner all the rest: here it may be seen that every one of these prophets was * as good in his age as Moses was in his; and this is what God said to Moses. "And the Lord said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee." Deut. xviiii. 17, 18.

Thus far it is proved that this prophecy has no reference whatever to the Messiah. The spring of prophecy was opened by Moses, and sealed up again by Malachi, and shall remain so until the Messiah shall come, and then the seal will be taken away, and prophecy will be restored to Israel, and will cease no more, for so it is written: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions. And I will shew wonders in the heavens, and in the earth, &c. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come." Joel ii. 28, 30, 31. And before all these things shall come to pass, the prophet Elijah will be sent to Israel, and afterwards will come the great and terrible day of the Lord.

* GALATIANS.—"For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." chap. iii. 10. This quotation from Deut. xxvii. 26. we read thus in the English version, "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all

the words of this law to do them." This passage is of great consequence to the gentiles, for by it they prove that, if a person observes many of the commandments of the law, yet is he under the curse, because it is written, all of them must be done. We are at liberty to search the truth, and commanded also to speak nothing but the truth. Considering this, we must first examine if the above statement is true; if it shall be found true, it certainly must remain so; but if it should be found false, then lawfully we may say it is not true. But before we proceed to the examination we must first make some preliminary remarks. Any thing that is known to the world at large cannot be denied. The miracles wrought by the hand of Moses in Egypt, by the Red Sea, in the wilderness for the space of forty years, are recorded in the great drawing of the law, and now known to the world at large. God delivered to Moses six hundred and thirteen commandments, and these commandments are called *the law*. God said to Moses, Teach my people Israel this law, that they may know to worship their God. Moses did as he was commanded. Further it should be known that some of these commandments could be observed by no other person except by a prophet; some by the high priest, some were the duty of the Levites; some the duty of a judge. Here will arise a question, how could he who was not a prophet, or he who was not a high priest, or he who was not of the tribe of Levi, or he who was not a judge, observe all these commandments? Secondly, a Jew is commanded that if his wife brings forth a son he must be circumcised when

eight days old ; but when his wife was barren he could not perform this command. Thirdly, If the son was a first born, the father was obliged to bring the child before the priest when he was thirty days old, and to redeem his first born by paying five shekels ; but, if his wife brought forth the first child a girl, this command could not be observed. Fourthly, If his wife brought forth no sons but daughters, then he could not observe either the one or the other.—Fifthly, If a Jew had a brother, and he died and left no child, then the command is, that the living brother must marry her : now, if a Jew has no brother, how can he observe this command ? or, if his brother left children, then he could not marry her. There are numbers more of the same kind, that could not be observed, except in particular instances, and the few here mentioned are sufficient for the present purpose.

We must now hear the instruction of Moses. Moses says, If thou hast a son he must be circumcised. One of the Jews cried out, Lord Moses, I never can observe this command. Moses said to him, Why ? He said, Because I never had a son. Another Jew came to Moses, crying, and said, Lord Moses, I and my family are for ever undone. Moses said to him, Why so ? He said, I wish to go into the tabernacle, and if I go there, thou wilt order to kill me, because it is written, And the stranger that cometh into the tabernacle shall be put to death. Numbers iii. 10. Now if I do not perform this command, I remain under the curse, because this is one of the commandments of the law. Another Jew came before Moses, and

said, Thou hast given us a law which will make us miserable for ever. Moses said, My son, why so? He answered and said, Because I never was a judge in Israel, and I cannot do this command which is one of the law. Another came and cried out, I am undone. Moses said, Why so, my son? He said, If I had a brother, and he had died without children, I should have married his wife, which is one command of our law; but alas, I never had a brother, and now I shall remain under the curse of the law, because I cannot perform all the commandments. A woman came before Moses; she cried and said, I am not able to support myself for grief. My daughter, said the good Moses, what is your trouble? She answered and said, We are commanded to keep the commandments of the law, and there is one particular command in the law of jealousies: When a wife goeth aside to another instead of her husband, and is defiled. Num. v. 29. Master Moses what shall I do, if I go and defile myself, I then must come before the priest, and must drink the bitter water by which I for certain shall die; and if I keep honest, I am not the better, because I remain under the curse of the law, because I cannot perform this command; what shall I do now? A virgin, the daughter of a priest, came before Moses; she said to him, Lord Moses, be so good as to give me your advice. Moses said, What hast thou to say, my daughter? She said, I have read one command in the law, which is, And the daughter of any priest, if she profane herself by playing the whore, she profaneth her father, she shall be burnt in fire. Lev. xxi. 9. What shall I do now? I am standing between

two fires. This is one commandment of the law. If I go and play the whore, thou wilt order me to be burnt in fire; but, if I keep honest, I am not better, because I shall remain under the curse of the law; and I consider the one is fire, but the other worse than fire, for here I shall live all the days of my life under a curse, and die under the curse.

A QUESTION FOR THE CHRISTIANS TO ANSWER.—If I ask them, if God is just, they all will say, Yes; but what will they say to the above statement? has God given a law to his chosen people that they should be under a curse? God said, This command a priest shall do, and if an Israelite should do it he must die; and because he obeyed not the command of God, he must remain under a curse. God said, Thy son shall be circumcised; but God never gave him a son, and therefore he must remain under the curse. The virgin did not play the whore, but kept honest; and her reward is to abide under a curse. If this should be true, could God be called a true God? I long to hear the answers to these things. But what can they answer? Nothing; they must confess that God is just in all his ways; and if so, their whole argument is false.

* PROOF.—First, it ought to be known that Paul did not quote this passage to the Jews, but to the Galatians; and here he took the advantage of the ignorant gentiles to inform them of things that are not true. * For any person that knows the original Hebrew will see at once that what I have said is true. I shall quote here again the whole verse as it is in the Hebrew: "Cursed be he that

confirmeth not the words of this law to do them;" which is to say, that he must do and observe all those commandments that he can, and which may be done. But Paul, to deceive the gentiles, inserted the word *all*. This word was of great use to him, for by it he preached a whole sermon, and the whole of his text depended upon this word. But what is most surprising is, to see at this very day the Christians bringing forward this passage as a great proof against the Jews, that they are under the curse, because they cannot observe all the commandments of the law: at the very same time the Christians confess that a Jew is bound to observe only those commandments which he may observe lawfully; and here is the proof. In the English version, the word *all* is put in Italic letters, to shew that the word *all* is not in the text. The question will now be, if the word *all* is not in the text, how came they to take the liberty with the law of God thus far? Have they inserted the word *all* to please Paul, and to give offence to God? I maintain that the English version has done wrong in inserting the word *all;* but wonderful it is, and a marvellous thing in our eyes, to see, that even to-day they insist that it shall be so, right or wrong. But what will they say in the day of judgment, when they shall be called upon to answer for this offence? * Let them only take notice what God said to Joshua, "this book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein; for then shalt thou make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success."

Joshua i. 8. " But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night. Then he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of waters, &c. Psalm i. 2, 3. " Great peace have they which love thy law; and nothing shall offend them." Psalm cxix. 165. " And God said unto Balaam, Thou shalt not go with them: thou shalt not curse the people; for they are blessed." Numbers xxii. 12.

* CONCLUSION. The blessed God blessed his people Israel for ever, that is, in giving them his blessed law, by which they will inherit everlasting life; and to every one of the gentiles that comes to hide himself under the wings of that law.

THE FINISHING OF THE LAW.—" Happy art thou, O Israel: who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency! and thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee; and thou shalt tread upon their high places." Deut. xxxiii. 29.

* QUESTION RESPECTING THE DISPERSION OF ISRAEL.—If Israel offended their God, and if they were found guilty, why was their sentence of punishment, to be scattered? Why did not their God keep them at home in their own land, and punish them as he had done in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes? Israel might have been in their own land, and still have been subjected to one or another of the gentile nations. And they might have been slaves in their own country, and have pined away in their iniquity, and in the iniquity of their fathers; and so it might have been done until this day. But we see that a home punish-

ment would not answer the purpose of God; and hence we may plainly learn that some great thing will proceed at last from this dispersion.

Perhaps some person will say, No such thing, and that when Israel was scattered in their sin they offended their God, and he became their enemy. This kind of reasoning is not well founded; for, if God should have become the enemy of Israel, he must have become the enemy of all nations. But we find the contrary: God loves his world; he is merciful to all his creatures; and the dispersion of Israel is also mercy and kindness; and, as far as I am able to learn, I consider that the dispersion of Israel is to answer two purposes; the one, to suffer for the sins of their forefathers and for their own; the other, to convert all the gentile world to the true worship of the only God of Israel; and the whole of this matter shall be explained at large.

1. God created this world that he should be worshipped by all his creatures, and that all of them should acknowledge him only as a God, and none else. But his greatest glory, due only to him, was despised; and, instead of paying adoration to God, they set up a stone, and a bone, a wood, the sun, the moon, the dead, the living; every thing they set up for gods. Thus the true God was robbed of his glory, in his own world, and by his own creatures. But will this kind of rebellion continue for ever? No, by no means, the time is fixed when it shall end. The world was created by order, and that every thing must keep his order; the great drawing of the law teaches and shews to us, that every thing in this

world is to proceed regularly, and that every thing has an appointed time.

When the world at large became rebellious in the time of the confusion of languages, Abraham was the only man that was found just in the sight of God. On this account, he and his seed were chosen to be the ministers of God, and at last to bring back the ruined gentiles. It was also foretold to Abraham that his seed, on this account, must be scattered among all nations. All this was told to Abraham; but there was also the time fixed when Israel should be made to know it. When Israel made the molten calf, that was the time to make it known, but the sentence is not yet passed.

When the spies returned, and brought a bad report, Joshua and Caleb informed the people that the land was very good; but their good report was disbelieved, and all the people gave ear to falsehood, "and all the congregation lifted up their voice, and cried; and the people wept that night." Numbers xiv. 1. The day when the spies returned was the ninth day of the month Ab, or August. The Lord said, the land is very good, according as it was reported by Joshua and Caleb; but still they would not believe the good report, but they rather believed lies, and they wept for nothing. But pronounce unto the congregation that this night is recorded already, that it shall remain for a weeping night in Israel, and that for ages. * In this night was burnt the first and second temple.

This bad report of the spies, in conjunction with that of the molten calf, finished the perfection of

the sentence. And here was passed the sentence, that Israel should be scattered among all the seventy nations; but when it was to begin was not told them. And that this sentence was passed in the desert, is confirmed by two witnesses; the one, "Therefore he lifted up his hand against them to overthrow them in the desert; to overthrow their seed also among the nations, and to scatter them in the lands." Psalm cvi. 26, 27. "I lifted up mine hand unto them also in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the heathen, and disperse them through the countries." Ezekiel xx. 23.

The commencement of the dispersion remained a mystery unto the Lord until the time of Daniel. Daniel the prophet was the man appointed for that errand: he did what he was commanded in pronouncing the sentence of the general dispersion: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city;" * that is, 490 years shall yet pass away before the beginning thereof, which is from the destruction of the first temple until the desolation of the second temple; and then will be the general dispersion.

2. We shall return again to observe the nature of a worldly kingdom. A king that has a large country, and all whose subjects are faithful, yet it would be impossible for him to make every subject for a minister; but the king will choose only one set of men, and such men as he knows are qualified for that office; and to his ministers he will give instruction, and whatever the king will communicate to the public at large, he makes it known unto his ministers, and then they publish

it to the public at large; also all the secrets of the king are only communicated to his ministers.

In the same manner the Lord did proceed. All the nations were his subjects; the whole of this world was his empire; he could not make all the seventy nations ministers, but out of all he chose only one family, and called him by the name of his first-born son, Israel; knowing that they only are fit to be entrusted with his secrets. Therefore he said unto Israel, Come, follow me in a secret place, that is, the wilderness; Israel followed him, and there he appeared to them, * and spoke with them face to face, and there he told him all his secrets; he also charged them to write down in a book some part of his secrets; * as for the rest, they must not be written in a book, but only kept a secret in our hearts. This was the written law, or the law of Moses; but the oral law was forbidden to be written down, and was only to be delivered from mouth to mouth. The Lord said unto them, Now I have entrusted you with my oracles, from henceforth ye shall be called my ministers, and so it is written, * "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation;" and so they will remain for ever. Exod. xix. 6.

3. *The Christians are pleased to say that *they* are now the ministers; but this is not true, for the day will come when they shall be obliged to confess, and cry out, "But ye shall be named the priests of the Lord; men shall call you the ministers of our God." Isaiah lxi. 6. Thus far, it is proved that Israel only are the ministers of God, but not the gentiles.

4. THE MISCONDUCT OF ISRAEL.—By continually provoking the Lord to anger, in worshipping the false gods of the gentiles, they continued in their errors until their measure became full, and then they fell; the temple was burnt, the holy land was laid waste, and they were carried away into captivity, even into Babylon.

* IDOLATRY TAKEN AWAY FROM ISRAEL.—This is a surprising thing; for, from the time they entered Babylon until this very time, idolatry is an abhorrence to Israel; and from that time until this day, Israel has worshipped nothing else but the true God: to this all the nations are witnesses.

But here we ask how, or by what means, did idolatry cease from Israel? Was it by accident, or was it done by the hand of God? It was certainly not accidental, but was done by the hand of God, for the time drew near for the general dispersion of Israel, when they were to wander among all nations: and, * if idolatry had not been taken away from them, Israel would have been soon lost among the nations: nay, even their very name would have been extinct: therefore the Lord blotted out from the heart of Israel the desire of worshipping strange gods.

It is well known, that during the time of the second temple Israel served only the God of their forefathers: four hundred and ninety years were given to Israel to prepare for their general dispersion, * and all of them were the servants of the true God at that time. The second temple was destroyed, and Israel was scattered abroad, even among all the nations. The Lord said, This is the proper time for my people Israel * to begin

their ministry: and he said to them, Your fathers have recompensed me evil instead of good. I said unto them, Thou shalt have no other gods before me; but they soon polluted my command; they made a molten calf, and worshipped it, and sacrificed thereunto, and said, These be thy gods, O Israel. I then lifted up mine hand unto them, that I would scatter their seed among the gentiles. Now for the idolatry of your fathers, and your own sins, *you shall go abroad and make an atonement; and the atonement shall be, that you shall preach against idolatry among the nations. I know you will suffer much, and you must suffer, yea, even a great deal for my name's sake: but never despair; remember that I have passed my holy word already, to make thee Lord over all the sons of Adam; and in due time I will fulfil my word. I also will never forget them that shall be kind to you; but *all those families that shall trouble you, they shall receive punishment.

Jews and gentiles believe that God created the heaven and the earth, and all that is in them; the Lord created mankind that they should be happy, but the sons of Adam turned aside. What was to be done? they must all return, but there must be some means devised how to bring them all back. Here God acted like a wise husbandman, who, having *one bushel of fine wheat, will not keep it concealed; for so it never will increase: but he will scatter it abroad, and by so doing he expects a good harvest. And the only seed which was to be scattered was Israel; for they are the ministers, they must preach, but no others; as it is written: *This people have I

formed for myself; they shall shew forth my praise, *but not the gentiles*. Isaiah xliii. 21. And again, "O give thanks unto the Lord; call upon his name; make known his deeds among the nations." Psalm ciii. 1. "Declare his glory among the heathen, his wonders among all nations." Psalm xciii. 3. Thus far it is proved, that Israel was scattered, first, to suffer, and secondly, to preach to all nations. We ought also to consider that, if Israel were not scattered abroad, and only punished at home in their own land; in the day of judgment, it would be a fine excuse for many of the nations, when the Lord should say, Why have ye despised my honour? I am the only true God, and ye made to yourselves strange gods: their answer would be a very good one; they would say, Lord, we never had any true instruction. Then he would say, Why did not you go and learn of my people Israel? They would say, Lord, we never heard of Israel; we know not their land, neither the people. By this means, many nations that are afar off from the holy land would escape punishment. * But now no excuse can be made; Israel, the ministers of God, are sown almost in every nation.

5. When Israel was scattered abroad, the nations observed that this people differed from all nations in laws and ceremonies; and one of the nations said to a Jew, Come and take my daughter for a wife: he said, I am forbidden by my law: then he said, Come and eat with me: he answered and said, My law has forbidden me to eat with you. The gentile said, Give me information in your law. The Jew began to expound to him

the law; and thus the gentiles, in process of time, obtained a considerable knowledge in the Jewish scriptures. Then the gentiles began to explain those scriptures in a different way; and, because Israel would give no ear to their improper explanation, they began to butcher them; killing and murdering men, women, and children; and the property of Israel they divided among themselves. But Israel did not cease to preach, still knowing their duty; they preached not only in one country, *but every where they preached wonderful sermons, and that in every corner of the world. Now this fact, which I have here stated, is acknowledged by all nations; and in one corner, and in *one city*, Israel preached a sermon, and his text was, *That it was better to die courageously for the law, &c.* and, as he said, so it was done. Fifteen hundred of them *took knives and stabbed their wives and children; afterwards, the men set fire to the place wherein they were, and all of them became a burning sacrifice to the law of their God. Such surprising sermons Israel preached in almost every country. But none of the gentiles, yea, not one nation laid it to heart, saying, What can be the meaning of this people, preaching such shocking sermons? *They must have a good reason for so doing; and the gentiles will be undone some day or another; but this kind of meditation never was thought of.

6. The gentiles will acknowledge that which I have here mentioned to be true; but all this Israel suffered for their sins, and their sermons are nothing, because we see that all their preaching had no effect; and we until this day have

seen no harvest, not even so much as a beginning and we have not seen even yet that Israel should be the lord over all nations; but on the contrary we know the gentiles are the lords, and Israel are their servants. But remember this, that as long as the bushel of wheat is in being the time is not passed. It is well known that the bushel of wheat was cut down in sundry times, yet no sooner was it cut before it grew up again. This must be a clear proof that at last there will be a harvest and at the same time he who will be the gatherer of the harvest will certainly be also the Lord over the whole harvest; and in spite of all nations they will gain their point at last; and all those nations who despised the ministers of God, shall be glad at last to beg, and to say, "O let me go with you, for we have heard that the Lord is with you." Zech. viii. 23.

Although we have proved by Holy Scripture that Israel are the ministers of God, and that he only who is appointed to minister has a right to preach; yet, in spite of the word of God, the Christians will have it that they are the ministers now, and that they are to preach to Israel; and now they are to make the harvest, and to bring back the outcast of Israel to the knowledge of the new law. We know that there is only one holy God, one holy nation, one holy law, one holy land, one holy city: this was engraved on the tables of the great drawing of the law, before the foundation of the world, and so it must remain for ever: and so we find it recorded; "For I am the Lord, I change not." Malachi iii. 6. Now, if God is not changeable, then it will follow that

every thing must remain as it was ordained from the beginning; but, as concerning the *new drawing*, or the new law, not a word is mentioned about it in the great drawing of the law. *The Christians boast very much about this new law; and here we shall ask, If their new law permits them to make free with the blood of innocent people? They cannot say that they are at liberty to do so; they will say we are commanded not to murder. Now the question will be, how or by what means will they repay the blood of Israel, which they have so gladly and wilfully shed? They must be found guilty even by their own law; and even their own law is not able to save them after they have broken their own law, and profaned the word of God, and stained their hands with innocent blood; yet they will say they are chosen to be the ministers of God? And is it possible, that a true God would choose men of this kind? The Lord said, "Be ye holy, for I am holy."

8. *Perhaps they will say, This was done by our forefathers; but, as for us, we were never guilty of shedding the blood of Israel. This is true, but there is a way of killing people without a sword, that is, by continually publishing, and, in it, describing the abominable character of people, that all their actions are enormous; and painting them in such colours as are not fit to be ascribed to man: and this publishing is not only once but from age to age, even until this very day. It must be acknowledged by all nations that all this was done, and is done until this very day, to innocent Israel; and this kind of ill usage

may be looked upon as killing them by inches, and worse than killing them at once. What a crime is this; to take advantage of a poor defenceless people, and innocent in every case. Is this conduct becoming people that will say they are sanctified? Whether the offences of the fathers, or those of the sons are greater, I will not determine; but there is one above who will do justice in due time.

*THE TITLE OF ISRAEL.—That for their sake heaven and earth, sun, moon, and stars are created, and, if there is **no Israel, no world.* "Thus saith the Lord, If my covenant be not kept day and night, the ordinances of heaven and earth I would not have placed." Jer. xxxiii. 25. "Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; the Lord of Hosts is his name: If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever. Thus saith the Lord; if heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord." Jer. xxxi. 35—37.

Here we notice *that Israel, who observes the covenant of God, is the upholder of this world; for, if the law and its commandments are not kept, there is no world. Israel is called the sun, *Rachel is called the moon, the twelve tribes are called the stars; and, if the fathers are stars, of course the children also must be stars; for so

it was shewn to Joseph in his dream. Genesis xxxvii. 9. and so they are called: "And it cast down some of the host, and the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them; and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away." Daniel viii. 10. And because all things were created for their sake, therefore they had also the power to command every thing in heaven and on earth, and were obeyed. *Moses divided the sea. Joshua said to the sun and moon, stand still. Exodus xiv. 21. x. 12. Elijah commanded fire to come down from heaven. Elisha raised the dead. 2 Kings i. 12. iv. 34, 35. "Thy sun shall no more go down, neither shall thy moon withdraw itself. As the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain." Isaiah lx. 20. lxvi. 22. "They fought from heaven; the stars in their courses fought against Sisera." Judges v. 20. But still more may be said in behalf of Israel, for their title is above the angels: *though the angels are spirits, yet they are not called the sons of God: but to Israel it is said, Ye are the children of God.

Again, *we do not find that Israel ministered unto the angels, but the angels ministered unto Israel, as it is written: "The angel of God which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them." Exodus xiv. 19. "And, as he lay and slept under a juniper tree, behold, then an angel touched him, and said unto him, Arise and eat: and the angel of the Lord came a second time." 1 Kings xix. 5, 7. "For he shall give his

angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways." Psalm xci. 11.

But, when Israel lies in the dust, all the heavenly bodies are in mourning, and the mourning is proclaimed among all the heavenly hosts: for so it is written: "It is a day of trouble, and of treading down, &c. In that day the Lord God of Hosts shall call to weeping and to mourning, &c. Behold, *the Erellim, or angels, have cried without," i. e. because Israel is without their land; "the angels of peace shall weep bitterly." But when Israel shall rise from the dust they will all shout for joy, as it is written: "Sing, O ye heavens for the Lord hath done it; shout ye lower parts of the earth: break forth into singing, ye mountains, O forests, and every tree therein: for the Lord hath redeemed Jacob." Isaiah xxii. 5, 12. xxxiii. 7. xliv. 23.

10. *THE TITLE OF THE GENTILES.—They are called rivers and seas. "Wo to the multitude of many nations, which make a noise like the noise of seas; and the rushing of nations, that make a rushing of mighty waters. The nations shall rush like the rushing of many waters." Isaiah xvii. 12, 13. "And the nations shall be as the burning of lime; as thorns cut up, shall they be burned in the fire." Isaiah xxxiii. 12. * "All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing and vanity." Isaiah xl. 17. And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them; and there shall not be any re-

maining of the house of Esau; for the Lord hath spoken it." Obad. 18.

*THE LAST FORTUNE OF THE GENTILES.—All of them will acknowledge that all the evil pronounced against Israel, by Moses and the prophets, came to pass; *and will they not acknowledge also, that the evil which has been pronounced against the gentiles must come to pass?

*It is now 1774 years since the second temple was burned, and since that time Israel has passed through fire and water, sword and famine; driven from one country to the other; and they are brought down almost equal to the dust. *King David, when he saw this long captivity, and the trouble of Israel, cried out, "Yea, for thy sake are we killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter. Awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord? arise, cast us not off for ever. Wherefore hidest thou thy face, and forgettest our affliction and oppresion? For our soul is bowed down to the dust: our belly cleaveth unto the earth. Arise for our help, and redeem us for thy mercies' sake." Psalm xliv. 22—26. Here we observe, that, when Israel shall be bowed down to the dust, then will his salvation come; and that Israel is to suffer first is also recorded: *"Tribulation and anguish upon every soul that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the other nations." Rom. ii. 9. Let every one consider this, and they will find, that all those troubles that Israel has already gone through, the gentiles will also have to pass through.

It is astonishing that they will not consider that their time is yet to come. *Do they imagine

that the Messiah will forgive them all the evil they have done from age to age to Israel? *the blood of Israel, which was shed like water, cries, and will never be silent. *And here their own apostle declares, that tribulation and anguish shall also come upon the gentiles for doing evil; which is also foretold by Moses: "Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people: for he will avenge the blood of his servants, and will render vengeance to his adversaries, and will be merciful unto his land and to his people." Deut. xxxii. 43. The beginning of this verse should be remarked, *Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people:* *it is not said, Rejoice, O all ye nations, but only nations; this is to shew that only some particular nations are meant here, that is only such nations as never troubled Israel; and each man or woman of the gentiles that were kind to Israel in the time of their dispersion, all these shall rejoice with Israel, but no other.

12. *Whoever shall be the Messiah, he will be no friend to the gentiles; for so it is written: "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth shall set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against his anointed, &c. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron: thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." Psalm ii. 1, 2, 8, 9. By this prophecy, we may learn that, when the Messiah shall come, all nations will fight against him, and that he will subdue all of them; and

therefore he will be called *the *conqueror* of the world. This is also confirmed by the gospel: "That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; that he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, &c. And on this account he hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David." Luke i. 71, 74, 69. From all these things it may be learned that the Messiah is to come on account of Israel; to deliver them from the hand of their enemies, but to be of no benefit to the gentiles: * and this is also confirmed by the translators of the English Bible. See the title of Ezekiel xxxvi: 'The land of Israel is comforted by the heathen's destruction, and God's blessing of Israel.'

13. *QUESTION.—What shall the Messiah do for the gentiles? Shall he gather them? they are not dispersed. Shall he give them kings? they have kings. Shall he give them lands? they have lands. Shall he give them nobles? they have nobles. Shall he give them riches? they have riches. Shall he give them glory? they have glory. But Israel has lost all these things, and therefore they have need of the Messiah.

*THE PUNISHMENT OF ALL THOSE NATIONS THAT SHALL MEDDLE WITH ISRAEL, FORETOLD — By MOSES. — "Happy art thou, O Israel: who is like unto thee, O people, saved by the Lord; the shield of thy help, and the sword of thy excellency? and thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee, and thou shalt tread upon their high places." Deut. xxxiii. 29.—By DAVID.—"Pour out thy wrath upon the heathen that have not known thee. For

they have devoured Jacob, and laid waste his dwelling-place." Psalm lxxix. 6.—The very same in Jeremiah x. 25.—By ISAIAH.—"For the indignation of the Lord is upon all nations. And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh; and they shall be drunken with their own blood, as with sweet wine. Behold, all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded: they shall be as nothing; and they that strive with thee shall perish. Thou shalt seek them, and shalt not find them, even them that contended with thee: they that war against thee shall be as nothing." xxxiv. 2. xlix. 26. xli. 11, 12.—By JEREMIAH.—"Israel is holy unto the Lord, and the first fruits of his increase: all that devour him shall offend; evil shall come upon them, saith the Lord. Therefore all they that devour, they shall be devoured; and all thine adversaries, every one of them, shall go into captivity; and they that spoil thee shall be a spoil, and all that prey upon thee will I give for a prey. Fear thou not, O Jacob, my servant, saith the Lord, for I am with thee; for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee; but I will not make a full end of thee, but correct thee in measure; yet will I not leave thee wholly unpunished. ii. 3. xxx. 16. xlvi. 28.—By JOEL.—"For, behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land,

iii. 1, 2.—By Zechariah.—For he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye. Behold, I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all nations round about." ii. 8. xii. 2.—By Micah.—"Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion: for I will make thine horn iron, and I will make thine hoofs brass; and thou shalt beat in pieces many nations." iv. 12.—By Zephaniah.—"Therefore wait ye upon me, saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey: for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy." iii. 8.—*By Ezekiel. In the xxxii. chapter, from the 17th to the 32d verse, all nations are mentioned, and also the end of them. The prophet took notice, in the beginning of this chapter, of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and declared unto him that he should fall into the hands of Babylon. But in the 17th verse he makes no more mention of Pharaoh, or of the king of Egypt, but, in ver. 18, says thus, "Son of man, wait for the multitude of Egypt," &c. This prophecy should be understood well: in the first part he calls him Pharaoh king of Egypt, for so he was in the time of Babylon. The second part will shew that there should come a time when the name of Pharaoh would be no more, and Egypt should become a province to some other power. In the end of this chapter the prophet calls him again Pharaoh, but calls him no more a king. Here we observe, first, Pharaoh king of Egypt; secondly, the multitude of Egypt; thirdly, only Pharaoh. It is already mentioned,

that in the last sixteen verses is determined the fate of all nations, which shall come to pass in the latter days: considering this event, the prophet calls upon Pharaoh, who was cotemporary with Nebuchadnezzar; saying, Pharaoh, arise from thy grave; thou thoughtest thy fall was great; be now comforted; see this day the fall of Egypt, and then wilt thou say, that thy trouble was nothing to be equalled with the present state of Egypt.

14. *Just a little before the restoration of Israel, some of the European powers will declare war against Turkey; they will prosper, and take Constantinople; the Turks will fly to Egypt; the Europeans will follow them even into Egypt; there all the Turks will assemble to give battle; the contest will be dreadful, the Europeans will gain the victory; but those that will be slain on both sides will be innumerable. From thence the Europeans will march into the Holy Land, which they will also take without opposition. The great success of the Europeans in Africa and Asia, will make a great noise in all parts of Asia. The nations in the east of Asia, will assemble like one man, as well as the nations in the north; and both armies will appoint Gog to be the head and leader of them all. They will all be of the Mahometan religion, and one motive of their coming will be to relieve their brethren the Turks; the second motive, the fear of the European powers, lest they should subdue all Asia; their march is described in Ezekiel xxxviii. The march of Gog and his army will spread abroad, and the report of it will come to the ears of the Europeans. Of this march the prophet Daniel also took notice, as it is writ-

ten: "But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him;" that is meant the head of the Europeans: "therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many;" that is, he shall go forth to fight Gog and his army. "And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palaces between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." Dan. xi. 44, 45. Further we remark, that in the above sixteen verses it is mentioned that some of those nations shall be * circumcised, and some uncircumcised, and those nations of circumcision we know are all Mahometans. And this battle must be considered as the battle of the whole world, i. e. of the end of the four empires.

It is said by the prophet Zechariah, that "Jerusalem shall be a cup of trembling to all nations;" ch. xii. 2. which means this battle of Gog: and so in Zephaniah, that "the Lord will gather all nations before Jerusalem;" ch. iii. 8.

The same is described in Isaiah: "Come near, ye nations, to hear; and hearken, ye people: let the earth hear, and all that is therein; the world, and all things that come forth of it. For the indignation of the Lord is upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies: he hath utterly destroyed them, he hath delivered them to the slaughter," &c. xxxiv. 1, 2. And all these prophets meant the battle of Gog.

At that very time the ten tribes will be brought home by their leader, who will be called * the Messiah, Son of Joseph, and this is foretold by the prophet Hosea: "Then shall the children of Judah,

and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head; and they shall come up out of the land: for great shall be the day of Israel." ch. i. 11. The reason why Judah is mentioned among the ten tribes, is, that a great part of Judah went into captivity with them, as it is written: Sennacherib, king of Assyria, came up against all the defenced cities of Judah, and took them." Isaiah xxxvi. 1.

15. * We read in Joshua, " And it came to pass, as they fled from before Israel, and were in the going down to Bethhoron, that the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died: there were more which died with hailstones, than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword." x. 11. The same, and a great deal more, will be seen relating to the * battle of Gog: " And I will call for a sword against him; with pestilence and with blood; and I will rain upon him and upon his bands, and upon the many nations that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire, and brimstone." Ezekiel xxxviii. 21, 22. This battle will be known throughout the world, for there will be seen wonders in heaven and on earth: * " And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke." Joel ii. 30. If all the matters mentioned from page 38 to this place were taken into consideration, it might be asked, where is * the boasting of the gentiles? For all these prophecies against all nations must come to pass; and, if God is true, his word also must be true, and as he never changes, even so his word can never change. After that battle, immediately will commence the

16. * RESTORATION of Judah and Benjamin from all the four quarters of the world. We have already given an account why Israel was scattered, and that the main object was, to establish the true worship among the gentiles, that they should have no excuse in the day of judgment: but the prophet foretold * that the gentiles would pay no attention to what Israel should tell them, but all of them would remain as they had been before. "For all nations will walk every one in the name of his God, and we will walk in the name of our God for ever and ever." Micah iv. 5. From this passage we may learn, that the different forms of worship used by the gentiles are to be put away; and next we clearly see, that the only true worshippers in this world will be Israel; and observe the term, "And we will walk in the name of our God for ever and ever. He who will, may see * that the worship of Israel is not to be put away, but to endure for ever and ever. The gentiles know this passage; they can read it, they understand it, they know this is the word of God; and yet they will not believe it!

* But let us see what another says: "The gentiles shall come unto thee from the ends of the earth, and shall say, Surely, our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no profit. Shall a man make gods unto himself, and they are no gods? Therefore, behold, I will this once cause them to know, I will cause them to know mine hand and my might; and they shall know that my name is The Lord." Jer. xvi. 19—21. From this prophecy we learn, that at last the gentiles shall be * forced to acknowledge their own

guilt, and all of them will lay the charge to their forefathers; but that will be no excuse for them, for the words of the Lord are termed thus: Until now they would not know me, but now *I shall cause them to know my hand and my might;* hand and might are well known to mean punishment; and then they shall know my name. Further, we observe, that the prophet doth not say that the gentiles shall come *because they are called,* but they shall come of their own accord; but we ask, what will be the cause of their coming? the answer follows.

17. A promise is given to Israel, that when they shall be restored, and their restoration known throughout the world, signs and wonders will be seen in heaven and earth; as it is written, "According to the days of thy coming out of the land of Egypt, will I shew unto him marvellous things." Micah vii. 15. In the time of Moses there was * no need to shew miracles, except in Egypt; because all Israel was there; but by the restoration * miracles will be shewn in the whole world. The beginning of it is foretold by Isaiah; "All ye inhabitants of the world, and dwellers on the earth, see ye, when he lifteth up an ensign on the mountains; and when he bloweth the trumpet, ye shall hear. xviii. 3. It is well known when Israel was in Egypt, they could not be all in one place, but were * scattered throughout the whole land; yet, by the coming out of Egypt, we find all Israel, men, women, and children, in Rameses; for so it is written, "And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses." Exodus xii. 37. It is also known that Pharoah would not let Israel depart until the

last plague; but, when the first-born began to die, Israel was driven out of the land: and all was done in one night, and the next morning we find all Israel in one place: but this was the hand of the Lord, who * brought them all together at one time; and so it will be at the restoration, as it is written: "If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost part of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee." Deut. xxx. 4. And how they will march * is described by the prophet: "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?" Isaiah lx. 8.

When Israel came forth out of Egypt, they had no time to provide necessaries, because they were *driven out*; yet they were in want of nothing; for they had bread from heaven, flesh out of the air, and drink from the rock: even so it will be at the restoration. "They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in all high places. They shall not hunger nor thirst, neither shall the heat nor sun smite them: for he that hath mercy on them shall lead them, even by the springs of water shall he guide them. I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the vallies: I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree; I will set in the desert the fir tree, and the pine, and the box tree together." Isaiah xlix. 9, 10. xli. 18, 19. In those days darkness will be over the whole world, but Israel shall have light, for it is written: "For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness

the kingdoms: but the Lord shall shine upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee." Isaiah lx. 2.

When Moses came down from mount Sinai, the glory of God shone upon his face, so that even Aaron, his own brother, was afraid to come near him: "And when Aaron, and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face shone; and they were afraid to come nigh him." Exodus xxxiv. 30. Even so it will be in the restoration; the glory of the Lord will shine upon the face of * every true son of Abraham, in such a manner, that the gentiles will be * afraid to come near him; as mentioned above.

In those days also great troubles will be in the whole world; and great pestilence, so that few people will remain; * as it is written in Isaiah xxiv. * "And it shall come to pass that in the whole earth, saith the Lord, two parts therein shall be cut off and die." Zech. xiii. 8. Next, the words of the prophet will be fulfilled: * "The breaker is come up before them, they have broken up and have passed through the gate, and their king *(the Messiah)* shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them."[1] Micah ii. 13.

When the nations shall see the glory of Israel, that the Messiah walks on before them, and the glory of God on the head of them; then they will cry out, * "Who hath believed our report, and

[1] The word Breaker is in the original Peretz, which was the name of the son of Judah, and here it means the Messiah; and the prophet calls him the Breaker, which this name signifies; and it is a proper name for the Messiah, for he will break down all the kingdoms of this world. King David also says the same: "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron." Psalm ii. 9.

to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" Now we see, this is the people of God. And then will be fulfilled the prophecy; "And their seed shall be known among the gentiles, and their offspring among the nations: all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed." Isaiah liii. 1. lxi. 9. At the same time, also, will be fulfilled the prophecy of Zechariah: "Ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you; for we have heard that God is with you." viii. 23. So it was in the time of Moses, that great numbers of Egyptians forsook their own land, and followed Israel. "The nations shall see and be confounded at all their might: they shall lay their hand upon their mouth, their ears shall be deaf; they shall lick the dust like a serpent; they shall move out of their holes like worms of the earth; they shall be afraid of the Lord our God, and shall fear because of thee." Micah vii. 16, 17.

Those nations that shall be near the land of Israel, will pick up every Jew they shall be able to find; and bring him for a present unto the Lord: "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the gentiles, and set up my standard to the nations; and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And they shall bring * all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations, upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules," &c. Isaiah xl. 22. lxvi. 20. Those nations afar off shall bring them in ships, for so it is written: "Surely the

isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from afar, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee." Isaiah vi. 9. In this manner will happen the salvation of Israel, and from thence Israel shall be saved for ever; they shall no more be ashamed; as it is written: "But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end. Isaiah xlv. 17.

* Next to this, all nations will come and acknowledge the Messiah to be their Lord and King, as it is written: "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the nations; to him shall the gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious," Isaiah xi. 10: And all those nations that shall remain in the world, from thence and further, shall be the servants of Israel, as it is written: "Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, *and his Holy One*, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nations abhor, to a servant of rulers. Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful, and the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their faces towards the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord: for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me." Isaiah xlix. 7, 23. Also, any nation that shall say, I will not be subject to Israel, I will not be his servant, shall perish, as it is written: "For the na-

tion and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish: yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted. The sons also of those that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee, The city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel." Isaiah lx. 12, 14.

THE BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE AND CITY.—After this, the temple shall be rebuilt, as it is described in Ezekiel. Also Jerusalem shall be built, as it is written: "Behold I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and thy foundation with sapphires; and I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones." Isaiah liv. 11, 12.

*THE LIFE OF ISRAEL WILL BE AS LONG AS THE DAYS OF ADAM.—"There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days; for the child shall die a hundred years old: for as *the days of the tree *of life* are the days of my people; and mine elect shall long enjoy the works of their hands. And it shall come to pass, that before they call I will answer; and while they are yet speaking I will hear." Isaiah lxv. 20, 22, 24.

*THE UNITY OF GOD ESTABLISHED.—This will be called the New World, or the world of the Messiah. At that time the Lord will be established throughout the whole world, and it will be known that he is the only God in heaven, above the heavens, in the earth, and beneath the earth; on the East, West, North, and South: and that will be the time when the Lord shall be king over the

whole earth; *but not until that time.*—In Exodus xv. we observe, Moses and all Israel sang one song when they passed through the Red Sea; and every one of Israel made use of every word, and one did not differ from the others even in one single word: and it is a part of the law, therefore it must be acknowledged that the Lord poured out his Holy Spirit upon every one in Israel. But we see one surprising thing in this song; "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever." The question is here, Why did Moses say, The Lord *shall* reign? why not the Lord *reigned?* whereby it would be understood that they praised the Lord, who was, and is, and shall be for evermore. But from the text we learn only, that in a *future time* the Lord will be Lord, but not before he shall reign.—One instance more we find: "The Lord shall be king over all the earth." Zec. xiv. 9. By this passage we may learn that God shall be king *in future*, but not *until then.*—Both of these quotations are the words of God, and therefore they must be true; and it must be considered that at the present time the Lord is not king over the whole earth: * because he is not worshipped as the only God through heaven and earth, and the glory which is due to him alone man has given to a bone, and to a stone; to the wind, the fire, the water, animals, the sun, the moon, and to dead men; every one of these is mentioned here as being worshipped as a god, and now is the same. —We find it recorded that several men said, I am a god, but none of them died a good death. King Pharaoh was the first that said he was a god; his punishment was to be drowned in the Red Sea.—

* Jóash, king of Judah, was the second that made himself a god; he also received his punishment, and he was slain upon his bed, and by his own servants.—Sennacherib was the third that made himself a god; he was slain by his own sons.—* Hiram, of Tyrus, was the fourth; he also was slain by the hand of Nebuchadnezzar.—Nebuchadnezzar was the fifth that made himself a god; he also received his punishment; for he was driven from men, to dwell with the beasts of the field; and this kind of punishment was worse than death itself. And in the same manner * every man that said he was a god never died a natural death: all these demi-gods were slain: but those punishments inflicted on them were only a punishment on their bodies; but the punishment of their souls is laid up in store for the day of judgment; for that will be the day for the end of all the false gods, and so they all will end with them together.

When Balaam the prophet saw that in future times men would say they were gods, he cried out; "God is not a man." Num. xxiii. 19. But if he still will say, Man is a god, tell him he is a liar. David also speaks against them, * "They that make them shall be like unto them; so also shall be every one that trusteth in them." Psalm cxv. 8. "They are vanity, and the work of errors; in the time of their visitation they shall perish." Jer. x. 15. "I, even I, am he that comforteth you; who art thou that thou shouldest be afraid of man that shall die, and of the son of man that shall be made as grass?" Isa. li. 12. "Cease ye from man, (that is, to say he is a god,) whose breath is in

his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?" Isa. ii. 22; which is to say, that man is mortal. "And the idols he shall utterly abolish." Isaiah xi. 8. And in that day will be fulfilled, "And the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day," ver. 17; which is to say, that at that time all the earth shall know that there never was another god, but only the God of Israel.—We also learn from the words of the apostle Paul, "When all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him; that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 28. The question here is, * what does Paul mean by this sentence, *All in all?* why did he not explain it? What can now be learned from it? Is it as much as to say, that only God, the God of Israel, will be then known, that he is the only God, and that is all in all; and that all other gods will come to nothing, but God will remain for ever? And this sense only can be the construction of it; for he says, that Christ shall be subject, and shall deliver up the kingdom to God, and then God will be all in all: and *indeed this is true, for he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, but that will not take place till the restoration of Israel.*—* The *last* verse of the Song of Moses ought to strike the mind of every man; for we may ask the question, why this verse is not the *first* in the song, as indeed it ought to be; but we find it not so, for it is the *last;* "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever:" by this we may learn that it is the *last*, because it will take place in the *last* days.

The gentiles perhaps will say, We also believe

that there is only one God, and yet there are three, as it is written: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." John v. 7. This is not true, and there is no truth in it; and this we shall prove as clear as possible.

First, these three ought to be equal in every degree, that is in *power, glory, honour, wisdom,* and *life;* but it is not so. The first is *power;* * "My Father is greater than I." John xiv. 28. The second *glory;* at last he shall have no kingdom and be subjected. 1 Cor. xv. 28. In this passage may be included *glory* and *honour.* The third *wisdom;* * "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son, but the Father.*" Mark xii. 32. The fourth *life;* Christ lost his life, and shall be subjected in due time: but God is life everlasting, never to be subjected, but to be Lord over all that is in heaven and earth for evermore. Now these statements are a clear proof that these three are not one, because the *one* has the *power, glory, honour, wisdom, life:* but the *other* has *nothing,* and is to be *nothing* at last.

Next we shall come to examine the difference between the Holy Ghost and Christ. Christ says, "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Matt. xii. 32; Mark iii. 28. Luke xii. 10.; 1 John v. 16. Here also it may be seen * that the difference is uncommonly great; because whatsoever you speak against Christ it is forgiven,

but if you speak against the Holy Ghost it is never to be forgiven.—* Secondly, Christ says, "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man," Matt. xv. 11. Again, "But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and behold all things are clean unto you." Luke xi. 41. But let us see what the Holy Ghost says: "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well." Acts xv. 28. These are commandments in opposition to that of Christ; and, if one differs from the other, then they are divided amongst themselves, they certainly never can be called one. And again; "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, **a man* approved of God, whom God hath raised up." Acts ii. 22. You may learn from this passage that he was no more than *a man*; as the text says, "a man approved of God."

Thus far we have proved that these three cannot be one, because each differs from the other, and they are divided among themselves; and wherever there is a division there is no *Unity*; * and if there is no *Unity* there can be no *Trinity*; and if there is no *Trinity* then it must remain that there is but one living God, and the rest is *nothing*. I will not lie, but will speak the truth, that I feel very much for the world at large; for the danger is tremendous, * to take the glory due to God alone, and give it to a *mortal man*, * Observe what Moses says; "See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no God with me; I kill, and I

make alive; I wound, and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand." Deut. xxxii. 39. It ought to be known, that, according to the original, this verse is translated improperly; and here I shall give the proper sense of it. "See now that I, even I, am he, and is no God with me; I shall cause them to die that shall say there is another God." Observe the term—*I shall cause them to die*. We all know, every man that is born of a woman must die; therefore here it must be understood, I shall cause them to die a second death; and that will be in the day of judgment.

* O how wonderful it is, that a great world of people should not see and understand, that the one is called the Father and the other Son: and who knows not that * a father is always above the son; and, if so, what connexion has the one with the other? A man is called mortal, but why is he called so? the reason is because he is born to die. The very thing should be considered in the present case; Christ stands to be "subjected," and he that stands to be subjected, is subjected already.—And last of all, it ought to be remarked, that the very names will shew that there is no connexion between them. A Father is one thing, a Son is another thing, and a Holy Ghost is also another thing; three names must be three distinct persons: and how can they be one? Yet, after all, it is not surprising; because it was told before hand by all the prophets, that so it would be, and so it would continue until the day of the Lord; and then he would say to the gentiles, See now that I am the only God, and there is no

other God with me. And at that time will be fulfilled the words of the prophet; "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one." Zech. xiv. 9. From this we learn, that until the day of the Lord his kingdom is considered as if he had not the dominion over the kingdom of this world, neither will his name be one, but more than one; but, when the day of the Lord shall come, then will he make it known that he is the only king over all the earth, and at the same time will he also cause the gentiles to know that his name is not three, but ONE.

AN

ANSWER

TO

RABBI CROOLL'S

'RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.'

To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.—ISAIAH viii. 20.

Search the scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me.—JOHN v. 39.

The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.—REV. xix. 10.

ON THE

PREFATORY 'DECLARATION.'

Page 11. line 1. 'If ever,' &c. Whatever the author's design in writing might be, the book came into my hands under circumstances which induced me to conclude that he expected it would be answered, and consequently published. It appeared to challenge an answer; and, if none had been returned, the occasion of triumphing would have been given.

P. 11. l. 7. 'That the author is an enemy to Christians,' &c. There is no reason to suppose that Mr. Crooll is an enemy to Christians; but he is an avowed opponent of Christianity. The writer of this answer is far indeed from being an enemy to Jews; but he opposes Judaism as far as that opposes Christianity, and no further.

P. 11. l. 10. 'It is well known,' &c. This part of the declaration, being coincident with several things in the body of the work, will be considered in its proper place.

P. 12. l. 20. 'How much more,' &c. This passage gives me sincere pleasure; and I think it does credit to the writer. As a Briton, I feel a satisfaction at the acknowledgement from a Jew, that

he and his brethren, are treated better here than in any other country. It honours our national character: but that character, as far as it is truly honourable, is the result of clearer and fuller views of Christian principles than most other nations possess; and I still more rejoice in the testimony as honourable to Christianity, which is far dearer to me than even my beloved country.

P. 12. l. 27. 'But the real cause,' &c. As far as the tract here referred to is concerned, it is not requisite to make any remarks. I will, however, fairly acknowledge, that after all which has hitherto been published a Jew may have much to say for himself, and with considerable plausibility. Though I am far from allowing that either the Committee of the London Society, or Christians in general, have 'answered nothing,' I must own that very much remains to be done; and that the controversy between Jews and Christians has not hitherto been fairly brought before the public. Detached parts have been ably discussed; but the whole of Judaism, as opposing Christianity, has not been fully and comprehensively investigated. This conviction has increased in my mind during the whole progress of the present work.

Not that I hope to produce such a full and comprehensive investigation of the subject: I only say that, after a long course of years spent in studying the holy Scriptures, I may probably be able to bring forth some materials which have not yet been fully explored; and of which hereafter more skilful workmen may probably avail themselves. In this I am rather the more sanguine, as the investigation of the several topics brought before

me has imparted much light to my own mind on many parts of the Old Testament, beyond what I had before attained.

P. 13. l. 19. 'As soon as a Jew,' &c. I consider a Jew as an avowed opponent of Christianity; I do not expect him to speak with that reverence of my glorious and gracious Saviour which, I approve: and, whatever I may think or feel, I had rather shew by sound argument that what he advances is erroneous, than meet it with hard words.

P. 13. l. 28. 'If the Committee,' &c. This shews that the author expected that his thoughts would be published with an answer, by the Committee of the London Society.—God grant, that the answer 'may be for good to all parties.'

ANSWER

TO THE

'RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.'

THE title of the book, which I am attempting to answer, seems to throw an impediment in my way: for I as firmly believe 'the Restoration of Israel' as Mr. Crooll does; and not in a sense so entirely different from his own as he may probably suppose. This, however, will appear in the sequel throughout. In the mean while, it is enough to observe that the question to be examined is this: WHETHER THE MESSIAH PREDICTED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT BE ALREADY COME OR NOT? For, if he is, without doubt Jesus the Son of Mary is He. We therefore, with little variation, ask the question proposed by John the Baptist, "Art "thou he that cometh?" (ὁ ἐρχόμενος;) "or do we "look for another?"[1]

The motto, from the New Testament, "Prove "all things; hold fast that which is good;"[2] I most cordially adopt: and, earnestly praying for teaching and assistance to God who "giveth wis-"dom,"[3] I would proceed, with all seriousness, candour, and impartiality, to bring the infinitely

[1] Matt. xi. 3. [2] 1 Thes. v. 21. [3] Prov. ii. 1—6.

important question to the touchstone of the holy Scriptures.

As, however, my controversy is with one, who, while he often quotes the New Testament, does not allow it to be a part of "the oracles of God;" I shall forego all appeal to it *as authority;* and argue from the Old Testament exclusively, where the subject in debate does not expressly relate to the New Testament.

P. 15. l. 1. 'MESSIAH.—This name,' &c. If the name MESSIAH be applicable to a high priest; then, doubtless, THE MESSIAH was predicted as a high priest: yet Mr. C. never once adverts to this, or proposes the question—'Was the predicted Messiah to be a high priest, or not?' The high priests of Israel were frequently rulers, yet not always; but they were always *anointed, Messiahs.* It can hardly be said that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were *rulers,* except over their own families; yet it is said concerning them, even to kings, "Touch "not mine *anointed,* and do my prophets no "harm."[1] It may be noted, that the word Messiah, or *anointed,* does not occur in any of the three texts, adduced in proof, that the title of Messiah 'is always given either to a king, to a 'ruler, or to a judge.' This inaccuracy, however, does not in the least affect the main argument.

All the kings of Judah, and some of the kings of Israel, might properly be called "The Lord's "anointed:" and Cyrus, who was selected to perform special services in favour of the Jews, is thus distinguished; but the title is given to no

[1] Ps. cv. 15.

other king, or ruler, over a heathen nation, in the whole scripture. The reason of this is clear. The kings of Judah and Israel, and Cyrus, the friend of Israel, were, in different ways, types of him, who is emphatically THE MESSIAH, THE CHRIST, THE ANOINTED; the Prophet, High Priest, and King of Israel: but no other kings were.

The king of Tyre is indeed called "the anointed "Cherub,"[1] but the Hebrew word is not מָשִׁיחַ, but מְמָשָׁח; and the expression is used, not to honour him, but to expose his extreme arrogance.

P. 15, l. 17. 'He is to be only a Man.' The texts adduced do not appear, in any degree, to prove the proposition, after which they are placed. "David, Israel's king," doubtless meaning the Messiah, was predicted as a man; but that does not prove, that he would be '*only* a man.'—As this, however, is asserted still more strongly on the next page, the answer will be there given to it.

P. 16. l. 1. 'He must have both father and mother.—It is acknowledged,' &c. The words in Italics, '*but not by the house of their mothers*,' (p. 16. l. 14.) are here inserted as if a part of the text quoted; but they are the writer's gloss, or addition. The reader should well note this, for such additions occur in several places, and are suited to mislead the incautious.

It is readily conceded, that the genealogy of an Israelite, as far as it related to the allotment of his inheritance in the promised land, 'depended on his father only.' The daughters of Zelophehad,

[1] Ezek. xxviii. 14.

however, and other heiresses, succeeded to estates, in their own right: though not allowed to marry out of their own tribe.[1] When, therefore, the genealogy was made of any family in Israel, till it came to a man who left no son, but a daughter, an heiress, who married to one of her own *tribe*; it may be asked, Whose name was inserted in the genealogy after that of her father? If the heiress's name were inadmissible, must not her husband's be substituted, as the son of her father; in something of the same manner as Joseph's name is substituted for Mary's, as the son of Heli?[2] Again, Would it have been impossible, 'because the pedigree depended on his father only,' to prove a son of one of Zelophehad's daughters to be a descendent of Zelophehad? He would not be, on his father's side, a son of Zelophehad; but on his mother's only: yet it is evident that, as the son of Zelophehad, he must be entitled to the portion of his inheritance. Now, in the same manner as the son of Zelophehad's daughter might be proved the son of Zelophehad, Jesus may be proved to be the Son of David. He was proved to be the Son of Heli, as born of his daughter Mary; and Heli was proved to be the descendent of David.

The title to the priesthood was certainly confined entirely to the male line: and, if all the male descendents of Aaron had failed, no female could have inherited the priesthood, for herself, or for her son by whatever father. This event, which was not impossible, nor, after the death of Nadab and Abihu, very improbable, not being

[1] Num. xxvii. 7 11. [2] Luke iii. 23.

provided against in the law of Moses, when the whole of his instituted worship must finally terminate in case of such a failure; is a most convincing proof that he did not enact his laws by any human policy, but according to the express appointment of God.—There is, however, no need to prove our Lord's descent from David in this way. He is a priest indeed, but "after the order of Melchisedek." Nor is it required that he should be proved the heir of David's kingdom by the right of primogeniture; for he receives his kingdom, as David and Solomon did, by the express nomination and appointment of God. It suffices if his descent from David can be proved in the way that Abraham's descent from Adam is; (before either the law of Moses, or the customs and genealogies of Israel were introduced:) and this may be done according to those rules which are adopted in other nations; though the peculiar situation of Israel, especially as to inheritances and the priesthood, rendered more exact regulations needful in their case. The genealogy of Heli, the father of Mary, is traced back from the son to the father, without the least intimation of any interruption, or intermarriage with other families, or branches of David's family, in the male line only, through Nathan to David, and so to Abraham and Adam.[1] But, as it was not customary to insert the name of a woman as a link in such a chain, the name of Joseph, her husband, is inserted, who was by marriage "the son of Heli." As, however, Joseph was supposed to be

[1] Luke iii. 23—38.

the father of Jesus,[1] Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph also, in the line of Solomon to David.[2]

I am fully aware, that many Christian expositors have laboured, and still do labour, with much learning and ingenuity, to prove both the genealogies to belong to Joseph. But Joseph could not be actually *begotten* both by Jacob and by Heli.[3] He could not be descended, by the father's side, from both Solomon and Nathan: intermarriages, as may be learned from Mr. C.'s statement, are wholly inadmissible in such genealogies; 'the pedigree depends on the father only;' except in such a case as that of Zelophehad's daughters; or that of Mary the mother of Jesus. Their labour must therefore be in vain; and far worse than in vain; as perplexing a simple subject of considerable importance, though not of so high importance as the Jews imagine. For the modern Jews evidently suppose that no genealogy of Jesus, however exact and satisfactory, can prove Jesus to be 'the Son of David,' on the supposition that he had no human father: and they think this imagined impossibility a demonstration against his being the promised Messiah. If it can be proved, with whatever cogency, that he was the Son of Mary, and that Mary was the descendent of David; this does not, in the view of some among them, at least, at all help the argument. Indeed their reasoning is not very

[1] Luke iii. 23. The clause, "as was supposed," seems to stand a good deal in the way of the Jews, in this argument; so that one of the body conjectures, without any proof, that the words were interpolated.

[2] Matt. i. 1—17. [3] Matt. i. 16. Luke iii. 23.

perspicuous: but, as far as I can understand, it amounts to this: A man is indeed the *son* of his mother; but he is the *seed* of his father only; because the *seed* is of the male, and the female is the *ground* on which it grows. If this be not their meaning, I am open to correction, and shall be glad to be set right.

I allow, that the word *seed*, in this sense, is generally and almost always thus used in the Old Testament: in fact, I do not recollect more than one clear exception to the rule. But that exception is a very important and interesting one. It occurs in the first prediction of the Messiah: "I "will put enmity between thee and the woman, "and between thy seed and her seed."[1] Here, at least, is an instance of one being called "the "seed of a woman;" and in the very person, who, as the Son of Mary, is "the Seed of David." This coincidence is very remarkable.

Will, however, any man venture to say that Almighty God *cannot* make a virgin, continuing such, the mother of a son; who would be wholly her seed, as far as the human species is concerned? Now, Christians are convinced, that for reasons of infinite importance, God did once "create a new thing in the earth,"[2] and omnipotently effect this unprecedented work. And we ask: Supposing this "holy Child" should be born of a virgin descended from David; and that it was the will of JEHOVAH, that her child should be known as the descendent of David; would it be impossible for the Almighty God to prove his

[1] Gen. iii. 15. [2] Jer. xxxi. 22.

descent from David? To prove it in the same way as his descent from Adam and Eve might be proved?

The objection, if it prove any thing, must prove that this would have been impossible to God himself: yet few would venture to maintain this, in so many words.

It must, I think, be clear, that God has condescended to shew the descent of Jesus Christ from David, with sufficient evidence. It should, however, be observed, that the proof, of Jesus being the Son of David, by no means rests on the genealogies alone. These the evangelists probably took from the registers of the Jews, as they found them, according to the custom of the times, without any alteration; and they were only answerable for the faithfulness of the transcript, which has never been impeached. But numbers, during our Lord's personal ministry, comparing his character, miracles, and doctrine, with the ancient prophecies of a Messiah, without any previous knowledge of his genealogy, confessed him to be the "Son of David."[1] Every proof of his resurrection proclaims him as "the Son of David," independently of all genealogies. Hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, had owned him as "the Son of David," before either of the genealogies was published. It is evident, that neither the apostles, nor the other writers of the New Testament, rest the argument, in any degree, upon the genealogies. They are not once referred

[1] Matt. ix. 27. xii. 23. xx. 30, 31. xxi. 9, 15. Luke xxiii. 38, 39.

to, in any part of the sacred volume: but the proof, that Jesus is the Son of David, is rested on the prophecies fulfilled in him, and on his miracles; but especially on his resurrection.[1] Neither did any opponent, in the primitive times of Christianity, stand forth, and demand a genealogy in proof of this; as is now done, when all the genealogies are lost!

Should the Jews still think that our proof of this point, from the genealogies, is attended with difficulty; I would, in return, inquire of them, How they intend to prove the Messiah, whom they expect, to be "the Son of David," now that they have no genealogies to appeal to? If they answer, By miracle, or by immediate testimony from God, without genealogy: then, I maintain, that it is impossible they should ever have more abundant proof of this kind, than we already have that Jesus is "the Son of David."

To assert, that all this is nothing, if he had not a human father, is to assume, without proof, the grand point in contest between Jews and Christians: but this must be determined in another manner, even by "the sure testimony of God."

P. 16. l. 23. 'A SAVIOUR—is not the name,' &c. It is allowed that the text referred to, in Zechariah, does not prove that the Messiah is called a Saviour; for the original word signifies *saved:* being the participle *niphal*, or *passive*. Christian interpreters, however, did not introduce the interpretation of our version; they only borrow it from the Septuagint, which renders the word σώζων,

[1] Acts ii. 29—33. xiii. 32, 33. Rom. i. 3, 4. 2 Tim. ii 8.

saving, (*active*;) and some learned men contend that the original may admit of that rendering but I would rest nothing on such insecure ground The prophecy, however, as acknowledged by a Jew to relate to the Messiah, is of considerable importance in the argument. "Rejoice greatly "O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Je- "rusalem: behold thy King cometh unto thee "he is just, and saved; lowly, and riding upon "an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass. And "I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the "horse from Jerusalem; and the battle-bow shall "be cut off; and he shall speak peace unto the "heathen; and his dominion shall be from sea to "sea, and from the river, even to the ends of the "earth. As for thee also, by the blood of thy "covenant, I have sent forth thy prisoners out of "the pit, wherein is no water."[1]

This is a very different view of the Messiah, of his victories and triumphs, of "the weapons of his "warfare," and the effect of them on the heathen, than that exhibited in the subsequent pages of Mr. C.'s book. I entreat the reader carefully to examine the several clauses of this remarkable prophecy, and to bear them in mind, as we proceed. There are three words in the original, each decidedly meaning an ass: *an ass*, a *she ass*; *the colt of an ass*. But the Septuagint seems ashamed of this humiliating circumstance, and uses more general terms; ὑποζύγιον, καὶ πῶλον νέον: *a beast of burden, even a young colt*.—We know that this part of the prophecy was most exactly and liter-

[1] Zech. ix. 9—11.

ally fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, when meek and lowly, as Zion's king, he entered Jerusalem on the colt of an ass, amidst the acclamations of the multitudes, "crying, Hosanna to the Son of Da-"vid:" "Blessed be the kingdom of our father "David that cometh in the name of the Lord. "Hosanna in the highest."[1] But let the reader determine, whether it be at all probable, that such a Messiah as the Jews expect, will enter Jerusalem in this lowly manner, when *saved*, and made triumphant over all his opponents. The scripture, however, cannot be broken: and, if Jesus be not the Messiah, the Messiah, when he comes, will certainly, in the literal sense, thus enter Jerusalem, as Zion's King.

I shall not enlarge on the other clauses of the prophecy. In whatever way we interpret the prediction, "I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, "and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle-"bow shall be cut off;" it cannot accord with victories obtained by the Jews in sanguinary contests, and with the slaughter of numerous enemies, in the usual way of war and triumph: for the establishment of Messiah's kingdom, at his coming, (and not the 'restoration of Israel,') is predicted, when by his apostles, "the weapons of "whose warfare were not carnal, but mighty "through God," "he spake peace to the heathen," and formed a most extensive kingdom over willing subjects in the gentile world. "The blood "of thy covenant" should also be noted: but I

[1] Matt. xxi. 4—11. Mark xi. 6—11. Luke xix. 35—38. John xii. 12—16.

forbear to enlarge, as the prophecy must be considered in another connexion.

Many other scriptures which Christians adduce concerning the Messiah as a Saviour, being warranted in so doing by the inspired writers of the New Testament, must not be used in this argument with Jews: especially as most of them at present, I suppose, consider him as a mere 'man, like other men.' It is not, however, correct to conclude that, because God is a Saviour; nay, because he says, "Besides me there is no Saviour;" none else can in any sense be called a Saviour. A Saviour is a *deliverer* from evil, temporal or eternal; from enemies, worldly or spiritual; from dangers of whatever kind. מוֹשִׁיעַ the participle hiphel of יָשַׁע is often used in this sense, and it signifies, *one causing salvation*. It is used of JEHOVAH, in the texts referred to below:[1] and of men in many other places.[2] Not only the great Agent is a Saviour, but his instruments also have the same title.

The prophet introduces in a most sublime manner, One who says, "I that speak in righte-"ousness, mighty to save." "Mine own arm "brought salvation unto me."[3] If this be a prophecy of the Messiah, he speaks as a Saviour, and as saving by his own power: if it be not, who, or what, is predicted?

The language of the Lord by Hosea is also remarkable "I will have mercy on the house of

[1] Is. xliii. 11 xlv. 15, 21. lxiii. 8. Hos. xiii. 4. Zech. viii. 7.

[2] Deut. xxii. 27. xxviii. 29. Judg. iii. 9, 15. 1 Sam. xi. 3. 2 Kings xiii. 5. Neh. ix. 27. Is. xix. 20.

[3] Is. lxiii. 1—6.

"Judah, and will save them by the Lord their God; "and I will not save them by the sword, &c."[1]

The Messiah is, beyond dispute, called "a "Redeemer;" an appellation at least equally appropriate to JEHOVAH. This Mr. C. confesses, and in a manner which in fact concedes the point in contest. "This is my covenant." 'What is that 'covenant; To send them the Deliverer: for 'what? "To take away their sins." (P. 11.)—Now a deliverer, to take away 'their sins,' is One who "shall save his people from their sins."[2] The Messiah is also in several places predicted as "the Salvation of God."[3] And no doubt Simeon gave the true meaning of these prophecies, when he said, "Mine eyes have seen thy "Salvation; a light to lighten the gentiles, and "to be the glory of thy people Israel."

But it is needless to insist further on this, If the Messiah was not predicted as a Saviour, or Deliverer, in one sense or another; what was to be the object of his coming?—It is manifest that the Jews expect a Deliverer from temporal evils, and worldly enemies: Christians rejoice in a Saviour from sin and Satan, from wrath and hell, "salvation with eternal glory:" They look to Immanuel, as "become the Author of eternal "salvation to all them that obey him."—In this view of the subject, they are so familiar with the term Saviour as used of the Messiah, and so in the habit of using the language of the Old Testament, in expressing their thoughts and feelings

[1] Comp. Hos. i. 7. Tit. ii. 10—13. iii. 4—6. [2] Is. lix. 20. Matt. i. 21. Rom. xi. 26. [3] Is. xii. 2. xlix. 6. lii. 10.

respecting Him; that they cannot but be surprised to hear it so much as questioned, whether the Messiah should be a Saviour or not.

P. 17. l. 3. 'THE SON OF MAN.—Ezekiel' &c. It is rather wonderful that the writer should assert, that 'Jesus never thought of such a thing' as being called God, or any thing more than "the "Son of Man." Had the Jews in our Lord's days thought so, they must either have given up their prosecution of him; or conducted it on other grounds. "Therefore the Jews sought the "more to kill him, because he had not only broken "the sabbath, but said also that God was his "Father, making himself equal with God."[1] "The Jews answered him; for a good work we "stone thee not, but for blasphemy; because "thou being a man makest thyself God."[2] "We "have a law, and by our law he ought to die, "because he made himself the Son of God."[3] It would be quite superfluous to quote any texts in proof that he called himself the Son of God, in the highest and most appropriate sense.[4]

Mr. C. asserts, that 'if Jesus is man he is no God.' This Socinians have often done: but assertion is not proof. "To us a Son is given, "and his name shall be called Wonderful, Coun-"sellor, the MIGHTY GOD."[5] "Without contro-"versy, Great is the mystery of Godliness, God "was manifest in the flesh."[6] Certainly man is not God, nor God man: but the general tradition

[1] John v. 17, 18. [2] John x. 30—33. [3] John xix. 7. Matt. xxvi. 63. Luke xxii. 70. [4] John iii. 15, 16. v. 25, 26. ix. 35. x. 29, 30, 36. [5] Is. ix. 6. [6] 1 Tim. iii. 16.

and opinion of nearly all nations, concerning incarnations of the Deity, are in diametrical opposition to these confident assertions. This at least implies a general persuasion that such an event is not a natural impossibility. Whether the Old Testament taught Israel to expect this mysterious event, must be tried by appropriate evidence.

The term, "son of man," as used concerning Ezekiel, simply means "a son of Adam" (בֶּן־אָדָם) And, as adopted by Jesus Christ, it signifies nearly the same; he was born of the stock of Adam: but it does not at all relate to the manner of his conception.—Mr. C. has been peculiarly unhappy in his quotation from the book of Daniel: for he adduces, not the words of the prophet, or of God by him; but the opinion of Nebuchadnezzar's baffled magicians: which opinion God was pleased to refute by revealing the secret to his servant Daniel.[1] The texts referred to at the bottom of the page may give some light on the question, whether the dwelling of God be ever with man or not.[2]

Having disposed of these assertions, or arguments, and this quotation; I proceed once for all, to collect from the passages quoted, a question, which I shall attempt to answer:

[1] Dan. ii. 11, 16—23. [2] Ex. xxix. 45. Lev. xxvi. 11, 12. Num. xxxv. 34. Ps. lxviii. 16—18. cxxxii. 14. Is. lvii. 15.

WAS THE MESSIAH, PREDICTED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, TO HAVE A MAN AS HIS IMMEDIATE FATHER?

If the Messiah was to be the son of a man and a woman, in the ordinary course of human nature, it could not reasonably be supposed that any notice of so common an event would be taken by the prophets. But, if he was to be an exception to all rules and examples, from the creation to the end of the world; it must be supposed that some intimation, at least, if not clear prediction would be given of it. If then Christians could produce nothing of this kind from the Old Testament, it would weaken very much their proof of the miraculous conception of Jesus; and even their evidence of another kind that he is the predicted Messiah. But, if matters are in this respect so arranged, as it might reasonably have been expected beforehand, it must powerfully combine with all their other arguments to establish their doctrine.

The well-known prophecy of Isaiah first calls for our most serious attention.[1] Let the introduction be carefully and impartially considered. "The Lord spake unto Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a "sign[2] of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the "depth, or in the height above:" either "a sign "from heaven, or one like the dividing of the sea." Beyond doubt, a miraculous sign, of the most stu-

[1] Isa. vii. 10—14. [2] אות Ex. iv. 9. viii. 23. Num. xvi. 38 2. Kings xx. 9. *Heb.*

pendous nature, vastly deviating from the ordinary course of human affairs, was intended.—But, when Ahaz perversely refused to ask a sign, God answered, "The Lord himself shall give you a "sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear "a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel." The introduction, and the call for attention, must lead every attentive and impartial reader to expect, that some manifest interposition of Omnipotence was about to be promised: but there would be nothing miraculous, or uncommon, in a virgin marrying and bearing a son; nor even in the name Immanuel, except as understood in the sense of the New Testament: nor have they, who adopt this interpretation, been able to ascertain who this virgin was, and who the son born of her, or why he was to be called Immanuel. Hezekiah, to whom some would apply it, had been born long before; for he was twenty-five years of age at his father's death, and his father reigned only sixteen years.

The words, however, will not bear this sense; and we appeal, not to Rabbinical Hebrew, or to the Rabbinical traditions and interpretations, but to the Hebrew Bible. Now, the original word (עַלְמָה) in the Hebrew Bible, uniformly means, '*a woman* '*who has not known man, by lying with him.* It 'is derived from עָלַם, *to be hid or concealed.* 'Hence עֶלֶם, *puer qui adhuc gnarus non est con-* '*cubitus matrimonialis: occultatus a re conjugali:* '*(Robertson:) and* 'עַלְמָה, *adolescentula puella,* '*sed virgo, sic appellata, quod esset, occultata* '*viro.*' *(Buxtorf.)*

"The virgin was very fair to look upon, and a "virgin, (בְּתוּלָה) neither had any man known

"her." [1] The same ideas are afterwards expressed in one word, עַלְמָה.[2] The word is also used concerning Miriam, when the history evidently supposes she was about twelve or thirteen years old, living in her father's house.[3]

The word occurs also in Proverbs. "There are "three things which are too wonderful for me; "yea, four which I know not: the way of an eagle "in the air; the way of a serpent upon a rock; "the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; and "the way of a man with a maid." [4] '*Promptissi-* '*mum est intelligere vincula, quibus virgo incipit* '*astringi futuro sponso suo; quæ a castis et pudi-* '*cis virginibus teguntur.*' 'It is most obvious to 'understand it of those ties, by which a virgin be- 'gins to be bound to her own future husband; 'which by chaste and modest virgins are covered.' The clause may, however, mean the various arts of insinuation, by which men win the affections of young women, while yet virgins; and at length obtain their consent either to honourable marriage, or dishonourable intercourse. The previous virgin purity of the persons concerned is evidently supposed: and the case of the adulterous woman, mentioned in the next verse, is totally distinct from it.

The plural of this noun occurs in the sixty-eighth Psalm, and is translated "damsels;" [5] where the obvious meaning is clearly coincident. It is also found in Canticles; and in one place as expressly distinguished from "queens and concubines;" [6]

[1] Gen. xxiv. 16. [2] Gen. xxiv. 43. [3] Ex. ii. 8.
[4] Prov. xxx. 18—20. [5] Ps. lxviii. 25. [6] Cant. i. 3. vi. 8.

and it occurs no where else in the Hebrew Bible. But בְּתוּלָה is of more frequent occurrence.

According to this constant use of the word, it is, in the passage under consideration, expressly predicted, that a "virgin," '*one who has not known man by lying with him*,' "shall conceive and bea "a son, and call his name Immanuel:" and it is predicted as a SIGN, a most extraordinary fact, a most signal interposition of Omnipotence.

If the Jews will not admit the evangelist's interpretation of this prophecy;[1] let them shew distinctly and without any *interpolation*, when and in whom it has been fulfilled, or will be fulfilled. Till this be done in a manner satisfactory to the understandings of learned men, of whatever creed; we have a right to conclude that it foretels the most wonderful event yet known on earth; the conception and birth of a Man 'without a 'human father;' and justly entitled to the name "IMMANUEL, GOD WITH US." For "his name "shall be called WONDERFUL, Counsellor, the "mighty GOD."[2] With such a clear and decisive prediction, other prophecies may fairly be considered as pre-intimations of this stupendous and infinitely important event.—On what account was the Messiah first promised and predicted, as "the "Seed of the woman?"[3] Till his immediate parent, the Lord Jesus, in whom we Christians confide, was the Seed of the man, at least equally as the Seed of the woman: but, not having man as his immediate father, he had been from the beginning emphatically foretold as "The Seed of the

[1] Matt. i. 21—23. [2] Is. ix. 5, 6. [3] Gen. iii. 15.

" woman." " Therefore, that holy thing, which shall " be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God."[1] —But how can this title belong to one born in the ordinary course of things, as other men are?

Thus, the opinion of the Jews, grounded almost uniformly on the language of scripture, that a man is indeed the *son* of his mother, but the *seed* of his father, combines in fixing the Christian interpretation of the original promise of a Messiah: and that it should be almost, if not altogether, a solitary exception to the rule, must be allowed to be a very singular coincidence with the language of Isaiah.

It is also said by Jeremiah, in a prophecy of multiplied blessings to Israel, " The Lord hath " created a new thing in the earth; a woman " shall compass a man."[2]—Now, for a woman to conceive a son, by an immediate act of almighty power, without any human father, and so " com- " pass " and carry him in her womb, and in due time give him birth; was indeed " a *new thing*," never before heard of: to effect this was, strictly speaking, " to *create a new thing*:" and this " new thing " was most intimately and inseparably connected with the great and gracious events predicted throughout the chapter.—' It is a new ' thing and unheard of that a woman should court ' a man :—so the Jewish nation shall return to God ' their Husband. So most of the modern Jews un- ' derstand the words.' (*Lowth.*) But is it indeed " a " NEW THING in the earth," and a work of *creating* power; for a woman to return of her own accord, if allowed, to her husband whom she had for-

[1] Luke i. 34, 35. [2] Jer. xxxi. 22.

saken?[1] Or even for a woman to *court* a man, who is not her husband? Witness Potiphar's wife; she compassed Joseph sufficiently in this sense.[2] Not to insist on the case of Ruth.[3]—'A 'woman;—the most feeble, despicable persons, 'compared elsewhere to women, shall discomfit a 'mighty warrior.' (*Lowth.*) But is this so wonderful a work of *creating* power? "So new a thing "on earth?"[4] It is indeed so far from being "a "new thing," that it has been done and is continually done all over the world. These are the two most plausible interpretations of the text, advanced by those who reject that above adduced: and they certainly are in all respects unsatisfactory.

Nothing has yet occurred, which forms even a plausible accomplishment of this prediction; except the conception and birth of Jesus, by the virgin Mary. If there has been any such fulfilment, let it be produced.

Here then, we have as clear a *prediction*, and as much *pre-intimation*, as the case required; or as the general obscurity of unfulfilled prophecy allows. And on this ground we answer, without hesitation, that the Messiah, according to the Old Testament, was *not to have a human father*; but to be the immediate son of a woman, and not of a man. "A female shall encompass a male."

But another question arises out of the same paragraph.—

[1] Hos. ii. 17. [2] Gen. xxxix. 7—12.
[3] Ruth iii. [4] Judges iv. 9, 21, 22.

WAS THE MESSIAH PREDICTED AS A MERE MAN, THE NATURE OF HIS PERSON BEING FORMED ONLY LIKE THAT OF ANOTHER MAN?

In order to shew from the Old Testament alone, that the Messiah is predicted as more than mere man; 'the nature of his person formed only like that of another man;' I shall first call the reader's attention to the words of the prophet Micah: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou "be little among the thousands of Judah; yet "out of thee shall He come forth to me, that is "to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have "been from of old, from everlasting."

As this is the prediction selected by the scribes and Pharisees, in answer to the question of king Herod, where the Messiah should be born; it will be allowed to belong to the Messiah. The variation of the Septuagint from the Hebrew; and that of the evangelist, as quoting it, do not affect the sense; and in this argument are wholly foreign to our purpose. We take the text as it stands in Micah. "The goings forth of him" who should be born at Bethlehem, to rule over and feed Israel, would be "from of old, from ever-"lasting." מִקֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם. Καὶ ἔξοδοι ἀνὶῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἐξ ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος: "And his goings forth from the "beginning, from the days of eternity." (*Sept.*) Thus these ancient Jewish interpreters translate the clause.—"In the beginning was the Word; "and the Word was God: the same was in the "beginning with God:"—"And the Word be-

"came flesh, and dwelt among us."[1] Is there nothing in the prophecy of Micah, similar to this declaration of the evangelist? Nothing at all different from what is spoken concerning the birth of other men? 'The words do naturally import 'an original, distinct from the birth of Christ, 'mentioned in the foregoing sentence, which is 'here declared to be from all eternity.' (*Lowth.*) "Art thou not from everlasting, JEHOVAH?" (מִקֶּדֶם) Here this word is used concerning the eternity *a parte ante*, of the everlasting, self-existent God. מִקֶּדֶם with this preposition, when duration is intended, always refers to past duration. The learned reader may consult the texts referred to;[2] which are, I believe, nearly all the places, in which it is used in this sense.—*Antiquitas: eternitas, si de Deo dicatur.* (*Robertson.*) Past existence, without any intimation of a beginning, is therefore intended.—It follows מִימֵי עוֹלָם, "from the days of eternity." Here also the preposition necessarily refers to what was past; and the words always imply past duration, either limited by the context, or wholly unlimited.[3] וּמֵעוֹלָם עַד־עוֹלָם אַתָּה אֵל "From everlasting to "everlasting thou art God."[4] When thus used concerning past duration, it seems always to mean a duration the beginning of which is *hidden*; according to the meaning of the root עָלַם. These

[1] John i. 1, 2, 14.

[2] Ps. lxxiv. 12. lxxvii. 6, 12. cxliii. 5. Is. xlv. 21. xlvi. 10. Hab. i. 12. *Heb.* It signifies "*from the east*," Is. ii. 6; and in many other places.

[3] Mic. vii. 20. 2 Chron. xxx. 26. xxxv. 18. *Heb.*

[4] Ps. xc. 2. ciii. 17.

terms, thus combined, and strengthening each other, establish the Messiah's pre-existence, yea eternal pre-existence, almost, if not quite, as completely as any texts in the New Testament. To evade this, the Chaldee paraphrast expounds it, "His name was foretold of old:" by what authority, or with what propriety, let the reader discover if he can. In this way of paraphrasing any testimony may be explained away and set aside, by a single stroke of the pen.

We would not, in reasoning with Jews, from the scriptures, adduce our Lord's words as evidence in the cause; but they contain an *argument*, which we call on them to answer if they can; for it completely silenced, though it did not convince, their unbelieving progenitors; and it is equally suited to silence modern Jews, Socinians, and Arians. "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son "is he? They say unto him, the son of David. "He saith unto them, How then doth David in "Spirit call him Lord, saying, the Lord said unto "my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I "make thine enemies thy footstool? If then "David called him Lord, how is he his Son?"[1] David died above 1000 years before Jesus was born, and 1800 more have since elapsed: but David, speaking by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, calls the Messiah, "My Lord."[2] But, if the Messiah was predicted 'merely as a man, like 'other men,' how could he, so many ages before his birth, be David's Lord?

[1] Matt. xxii. 42—46. Mark xii. 35—37. Luke xxi. 41—44.
[2] Ps. cx. 1.

If Jesse had lived till David was established in the kingdom, David might, in some good sense, have been called Jesse's lord, though Jesse's son: but could David with the least propriety, nay, consistently with the common sense of mankind, be called the lord of Obed, Salmon, Boaz, Judah, Abraham, Noah, or Adam, his progenitors? Yet this would be quite as reasonable as to call the Messiah David's Lord, if he had no existence till a thousand years at least after David's death. So conclusive is this argument of the Messiah's pre-existence and authority, as King of Israel, that we may challenge either Jews or nominal Christians to answer it, in any other way, than by denying the inspiration of him who wrote the Psalm in question. And who could be Lord over Israel's anointed king, in the zenith of his authority, but Israel's God and King?

Since this was written, a Jew has asserted, as he says, on the authority of a Spanish Jew in the eighteenth century, (contrary, not only to the general tradition of former ages; but to the very title of the Psalm, by which it is assigned to David, in the same manner that other Psalms are assigned to him, and indeed contrary to the whole history of David,) that Abner wrote the Psalm and addressed it to David, who was "the Lord" here spoken of! Had the scribes and Pharisees been acquainted with this circumstance, they would not have been put to shame and silence by our Lord's question; at least, not in the first instance. For, had they alleged this solution, he would probably have asked them, whether Abner addressed David in the subsequent words; "The Lord sware,

" and will not repent, Thou art a PRIEST for ever, " after the order of Melchisedek?" I believe it is not needful formally to disprove so unwarranted an assertion; which only shews the extreme difficulty with which the hundred and tenth Psalm continues to press the Jews.

When the prophet Isaiah, in the scripture which has been already considered,[2] says, " Behold a " virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall " call his name Immanuel:" can it be imagined, that the birth of 'a person formed only like that 'of another man was predicted?' Why, in that case, did JEHOVAH himself appoint him so extraordinary and significant a name? Is he what his name imports? If so, he is " God manifest in " the flesh."—Thus the evangelist understood it; and thus, apart from his inspiration, he most rationally understood it.[3]

Nothing can be more explicit than another prediction of the same prophet, " Unto us a Child " is born, unto us a Son is given; and the go- " vernment shall be upon his shoulder: and his " name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, " the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, the " Prince of Peace."[4] Do the various terms here accumulated, on purpose, as it evidently appears, to excite attention and to raise expectation, denote nothing more than the birth of a mere man like other men? Or is some other than the Messiah meant? These questions the Jews are called upon to answer: or to be silent, as their ancestors

[1] Phil. ii. 6—11.
[2] Is. vii. 14.
[3] Matt. i. 18—25.
[4] Is. ix. 6, 7.

were, when they "durst not ask Jesus any more "questions;"[1] and for the same reason.

Why should the name of this child be called WONDERFUL, if there would be nothing *wonderful*, either in his conception, birth, or person?—When the angel appeared to Manoah, who inquired his name; he answered, "Why askest thou my name "seeing it is secret,"[2] or WONDERFUL? (Is. פֶּלֶא—Judg. פְּלִאי:) and Manoah afterwards said, "We "shall surely die, because we have seen God." In like manner, after "his name shall be called Won-"derful, Counsellor," it follows, "the Mighty "God." Can there remain a doubt, whether the words which the evangelist introduces the angel speaking, at the birth of Jesus, be the true interpretation? "Unto you is born, in the city of David, "a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord."—"The "second Adam, the Lord from heaven."[3]

"The everlasting Father," אֲבִי־עַד "the Father "of eternity." Probably Bishop Lowth has given us the true meaning of this clause, "The Father "of the everlasting age."[4]

If only two or three such texts suggested the idea that the predicted Messiah would be God, assuming into personal union with himself the human nature, and thus properly be "Immanuel:" this would suffice to excite the caution of a humble and reverent reader of the sacred oracles; even while unable to receive "the great mystery of "godliness", with implicit credence. This however is not the case: and though enough has already

[1] Matt. xxii. 46. [2] Judg. xiii. 18—22.
[3] Luke ii. 11. 1 Cor. xv. 47. [4] Ps. xxii. 30. Is. liii. 10

been said to answer the inquiry, as far as Mr. C. is concerned, yet the vast importance of the subject impels me to adduce still more witnesses.

The Lord, by the Psalmist, most evidently addressing the Messiah, and in special respect to his anointing and kingdom, says, "Thy throne "O God, is for ever and ever; the sceptre of "thy kingdom is a right sceptre: thou lovest "righteousness and hatest wickedness; therefore "God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil "of gladness above thy *fellows*."[1] Is He then, concerning whom JEHOVAH speaks such language as he never employs concerning the highest orders of created angels, to be considered, 'as to the 'nature of his person, formed only like that of 'another man?' Or is he IMMANUEL, "God mani-"fested in the flesh?"—'They who imagine this 'Psalm to be an epithalamium, upon Solomon's 'marrying Pharaoh's daughter, must suppose that 'it is foretold, that Solomon was to have a nume-'rous progeny by her, whom he would set up for 'princes and rulers up and down the world.'[2]— 'But this cannot be true: for beside that we 'read not of any children Solomon had by 'Pharaoh's daughter, Rehoboam who succeeded 'him, was the son of Naamah, an Ammonitess. 'And, so far was he from being able to set up his 'sons to rule over other countries; that it was 'with great difficulty his successor kept two tribes 'of the twelve stedfast to him.—Certainly "a 'greater than Solomon is here."'—(*Bp. Pearce.*)

Without entering into the argument concerning

[1] Ps. xlv. 6, 7. Heb. i. 8, 9. [2] Ps. xlv. 16.

the word ELOHIM, translated "O God:" (which yet, used in the plural, with singular pronouns, and verbs, as in these verses; and evidently of one single person; is perhaps never used but for one, who is by nature God :) it must, in this place, at least mean something vastly superior in nature and person to those who, as he is man also, are called "his fellows."

It is not to be expected that a Jew should allow the words of Zechariah to refer to the Messiah: but a Jew may be called on to shew explicitly of whom, and of what events, they are to be interpreted, if not a prophecy of the Messiah. "Awake, "O sword, against my Shepherd, against the "*Man* that is my *fellow*, (עֲמִיתִי) saith the Lord of "Hosts: smite the Shepherd."[1]—(הֶבֶר)[2] *quod est socius*. That is, it means the same with the word translated *fellows* in the forty-fifth Psalm. As the Messiah's subjects are "his fellows," partaking with him in the same human nature; so he is "the Man who is the fellow of the Lord of hosts," as partaking of his divine nature.—The word is generally rendered *neighbour*; and is supposed by many Jews to refer to their nation exclusively. The texts referred to in the margin are, I believe, all in which it occurs.[3] The same *nature* is certainly meant wherever it is used. But can it be conceived that JEHOVAH should use such language as *proximus sibi, socius, particeps ejusdem naturæ*, to one, who would have no existence for many

[1] Zech. xiii. 7. Matt. xxvi. 31. [2] Ps. xlv. 7. *Heb.*
[3] Lev. vi. 2. xviii. 20. xix. 11, 15, 17. xxiv. 19. xxv. 14, 15, 17.

ages to come; and would then be a mere man, like other men?[1] In this view, the words of the same prophet, and the reference to them by the evangelist,[2] are worthy of our attention. "I "will pour upon the house of David, and upon "the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace "and supplications; and they shall look upon "me whom they have pierced; and they shall "mourn for him, &c." When has this prophecy received its accomplishment? or when will it; except when the Jews of all ranks, by the pouring out of the Holy Spirit, shall look to Immanuel, (whom their progenitors pierced; and whom they "crucify afresh" from age to age,) with penitent faith, humble confessions, and earnest cries for mercy and forgiveness?[3]

Time would fail, and I fear I should weary my readers, should I adduce all the scriptures of the Old Testament, which bear on this question. But the language of God by the Psalmist, "Thou "art my Son, this day have I begotten thee;" "Kiss the Son lest he be angry, &c.;" "Blessed "are all they that trust in him;" are decisive on the subject.[4] In what sense could the person spoken of be "the Son of God," in so appropriate a manner as is here stated? In what sense could he be the object of honour and trust,[5] if he were merely a man like other men? And, if the Psalmist did not speak of the Messiah, of whom else can

[1] Is. xl. 18, 25. John i. 18. x. 31. [2] Comp. Zech. xii. 10, with John xx. 39. [3] Matt. xxiii. 37—39.
[4] Ps. ii. 6, 7, 12. Heb. i. 5. [5] Ps. cxlvi. 3. Jer. xvii. 5, 6.

the words used by him be interpreted, without the greatest conceiveable impropriety:—Even the words of Solomon in Proverbs, are not without importance in this inquiry. For, though WISDOM may be considered as an allegorical character; yet the language used is so *personal*, and so accords with the other scriptures which have been examined, that it is far more rational and obvious to interpret them of the Messiah—"The Word" and "Wisdom of God." the feminine gender of the original is no valid objection. *Verbum*, by which Λογος may be translated, is neuter, and the Arabick word for it is feminine.

Let us then briefly consider the passage.—"The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his "way; before his works of old. I was set up from "everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the "earth was. When there were no depths, I was "brought forth; when there were no fountains "abounding with water; before the mountains "were settled, before the hills was I brought "forth. While as yet he had not made the earth, "nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust "of the world. When he prepared the heaven, "I was there; when he set a compass on the face "of the depth. When he established the clouds "above, when he strengthened the fountains of "the deep; when he gave to the sea his decree, "that the waters should not pass his command-"ment; when he appointed the foundations of "the earth; then was I with him, as one brought "up with him; I was daily his delight, rejoicing "alway before him; rejoicing in the habitable

" part of his earth: and my delights were with
" the sons of men."[1]

On this passage, I shall only call the reader's attention to two words used by the inspired writer "I was brought forth," twice used;[2] חוֹלָלְתִּי from חוּל, which signifies among other things, *to bring forth young*. It is *pual*, or the passive of *pihel* or rather *pohel*. *Genitus est: formatus est (Robertson.)* It is used in only a few places. "Art thou the first man that was born; or wast " thou *made* before the hills?" *Wast thou brought forth?*[3] "Behold I was *shapen* in iniquity, and in " sin did my mother conceive me:" or, "Behold " I was *brought forth* in iniquity; even in sin did " my mother conceive me"[4]—"Dead things are " *formed* from under the waters."—Or, "Vast " giant-like things are formed from under the " waters. *(Bp. Patrick.)* "Giants are *brought* " *forth* from under the waters." (רְפָאִים.) The production of the monsters of the deep is evidently meant; which are *brought forth* by the parent animal.[5] These are, I believe, the only places in which this passive form of the verb is used; and they sufficiently fix the meaning of it.[6] But how is the word applicable to wisdom, as an abstract attribute? In the meaning which it is most natural to affix to it, the coincidence with the scriptures before adduced, and with the language of the New Testament concerning " the WORD," " the only begotten Son, who was

[1] Prov. viii. 22—31. [2] 24, 25. [3] Job xv. 7.
[4] Ps. li. 5. [5] Job xxvi. 5. [6] See Ps. xc. 2. *Heb.*

"in the bosom of the Father," is peculiarly striking.—The second word, to which I would request the reader's attention, is rendered, "*One brought* "*up* with him;"[1] אָמוֹן, *Nutricius, educatus, filius in sinu patris gestatus*: ἐγκόλπιος. Wisdom had said that she was brought forth; now she adds that she "was in the bosom of the father:"[2] (*Robertson:*) a word from the same root.

What shall we say to the words of Jacob, a short time before his death? "And Jacob blessed Jo-"seph, and said, God, before whom my fathers "Abraham and Isaac did walk: the God that fed "me all my life long; the Angel that redeemed "me from all evil; bless the lads. &c."[3] If this Angel were merely a creature, was not Jacob guilty of idolatry, in ascribing to him "redemption "from all evil,"[4] and in praying solemnly to him to bless his grandsons? We might multiply examples of this kind; but I must only refer the reader to a few of the scriptures where they stand recorded.[5]

God says of Moses, "The similitude of JEHOVAH "shall he behold."[6] Now who or what is this "SIMILITUDE of JEHOVAH," except it be IMMANUEL, "the Image of the invisible God?"[7]—Again, Who was "the Angel of God's presence," that saved Israel?[8] Who was the Angel of the covenant? "JEHOVAH whom ye seek, shall sud-"denly come to his temple, even the Angel of the "covenant, whom ye delight in."[9]

[1] Prov. viii. 30. [2] John i. 18. [3] Gen. xlviii. 15. 16.
[4] 2 Tim. iv. 18. [5] Exod. iii. 2—6. xxiii. 20—22. Josh. v. 13—15. vi. 1, 2. Judges xiii. 15—23. [6] Num. xii. 8.
[7] John i. 18. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Col. i. 15. [8] Isaiah lxiii. 9.
[9] Mal. iii. 1.

All these things are perfectly easy, according to the Christian doctrine concerning "the great "mystery of godliness, God manifested in the "flesh;" but perfectly inexplicable on any other ground: as even the Rabbinical traditions, and endeavours to put another construction upon them most evidently shew.

Here I must cease, not because I have exhausted the subject: but for fear of exhausting the reader's patience. Lay all these scriptures together ponder each separately; appreciate the amount of them as collected together into a focus, like the rays of the sun in the burning glass: and then ask seriously and impartially, Does the Old Testament predict the Messiah, as one, 'the nature 'of whose person would be formed only like that 'of another man?' With confidence, and without fear of being refuted, I answer the question in the negative.

P. 17. l. 24. 'FORGIVENESS OF SIN.' As this entirely depends on the questions under consideration respecting the person of the Messiah, it needs not any particular answer. If the Messiah were predicted as IMMANUEL, he "has authority to forgive "sin." If as a mere man, and 'the nature of his 'person be formed only like that of another man, he has no such authority.

ON THE TIME OF MESSIAH'S COMING.

P. 18. l. 3. 'WHEN IS THE MESSIAH TO COME?' Under this head, I shall endeavour to give 'scrip-'ture proof,' that the Messiah is already come. Mr. C. indeed thinks that this must be done from

the prophecy of Daniel exclusively, if it be done at all; nay, he speaks as if Christians were ready to concede this! The prediction in Daniel, indeed, when fully and impartially examined, approaches as near to demonstration as the nature of the case can admit: but, before I enter on the consideration of it, or of Mr. C.'s remarks on it; I must prepare the way by examining some other prophecies concerning the Messiah.

Jacob, immediately before his death, pronounced blessings on his sons, evidently by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. In blessing Judah he says, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a "lawgiver from between his feet, till Shiloh come; "and to him shall the gathering of the people be." [1] שֵׁבֶט signifies a *rod* or *staff*, a *sceptre*, a *tribe*. When Jacob spoke, his posterity was no more divided into *tribes*, than formed into a kingdom. But he foretold that the sceptre, or rod of authority, (like the rod of Moses,) would devolve on Judah. Accordingly it did so, as soon as Israel was numbered and marshalled in the wilderness; and the tribe of Judah was the ruling and reigning tribe, in general, from that time, till the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. The word cannot here signify *tribe*: for "the tribe shall not "depart from Judah," that is, from the tribe of Judah, gives no tolerable meaning. It is used for a sceptre in two Psalms prophetic of the Messiah; [2] and in Ezekiel, where it is distinguished from an

[1] Gen. xlix. 10.

[2] Ps. ii. 9.—"A rod," or sceptre, "of iron." xlv. 6. "The "sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre."

ordinary rod;[1] and by Amos,[2]—"The sceptre "shall not depart."—'A king who is of Judah, 'and a legislator, shall not both at the same time 'depart. The *sceptre* departed in Zedekiah, but 'the *legislator* departed not: except when Christ 'erected his kingdom over the nations, and took 'away the authority from the former shepherds.' 'The sceptre shall not be removed from Judah; '(*dux, dominus, dominator, rex)* a leader, lord, 'ruler, king, so called, says R. E. because he used to 'bear a sceptre in his hand.—Kings and the royal 'authority, according to the threefold Targum, 'and the ancient Hebrew Talmudists, and many 'even more modern; so that they are employed 'in vain who interpret it otherwise.' (*Robertson.*)

"And a lawgiver from between his feet:" מְחֹקֵק, part. *pohel* from חָקַק *one decreeing, giving laws.*[3] The word occurs in Numbers, and is tranlated *lawgiver.*[4] In the plural it is rendered "governors."[5] "The portion of the lawgiver;"[6] that is, the portion which Moses, the lawgiver, had prophetically assigned to Benjamin; or that which Joshua, the governor, afterwards allotted him. "Judah is my "lawgiver," with evident reference to this text[7] "The Lord is our Lawgiver, &c.[8]—I believe, these are the only places in which the word occurs in the Hebrew Bible: and they are sufficient to fix its biblical meaning; namely, One having authority to enact laws, or at least to enforce by power laws already enacted. Ὁ Ἡγέμενος (*Sept.*)

[1] Ez. xix. 14. "She hath no strong rod, for a sceptre to rule." The Hebrew, מַטֵּה עֹז שֵׁבֶט לִמְשֹׁל

[2] Am. i. 5. "Him that holdeth the sceptre." [3] Matt. xxiii. 2.
[4] Num. xxi. 18. [5] Judg. v. 14. [6] Deut. xxxiii. 21.
[7] Psalm lx. 7. cviii. 8. *Heb.* [8] Isaiah xxxiii. 22. *Heb.*

"Till Shiloh come."—'That the ancient He-'brews by Shiloh understood "the Messiah," 'the threefold Targum teaches, or the Chaldee 'paraphrase of Onkelos, Jonathan, and Jerusa-'lem; in which it is written for Shiloh, King 'Messias." (*Robertson.*) 'As all the three Tar-'gums agree, and the Talmud in the title 'Sanhedrim; and many other ancient and 'modern Jews. I will mention only the words 'of R. Bechai, who confesses, that it is right to 'understand this verse of the Messiah.' (*Bp. Patrick.*)

Different opinions prevail respecting the derivation and meaning of the name: but the Peaceable One, "the Prince of Peace," as tranquil, 'and 'the author of eternal tranquility,' seems the most obvious. This, however, does not at all affect our argument.

It was then expressly predicted by Jacob when dying, as his words are recorded by Moses, that the Messiah should come while Judah continued in authority; and while the Jews, so called from Judah, had power to make laws, or to enforce the law of Moses; and to manage the affairs of their nation by a government of their own: but that, afterwards "the gathering of the peoples" (*plural*) would be to Shiloh; or the obedience of the people would be rendered to him.

It is needless to go through the detail of the history of Israel, and of the ruling and legislative authority of Judah, previous to the Babylonish captivity. From the accession of David to the eve of that event, during almost 500 years, his deseendents from father to son, possessed the

kingdom, in lineal succession. Then, indeed, "the tabernacle of David" fell into ruins: yet, even during the captivity, some authority over the Jews, and their internal affairs, was evidently vested in the descendents of Josiah: and Zerubbabel, under whom the Jews were restored, was of that family. The whole nation, however, was from that time called Jews, or *Judeans:* and, though not wholly independent, they retained their distinction as a nation, and were generally governed by rulers from among themselves, during the continuance of the Medo-Persian and Macedonian kings, and for some time after the Romans gained the ascendancy. Even these conquerors did not deprive Judah of the sceptre and lawgiver. King Herod, indeed, was by birth an Edomite; but he was a Jew, as proselyted: the Sanhedrin still possessed great authority, with little interference of the Romans, till after the birth of Jesus. But soon after, at the death of Archelaus, Judea was reduced to be a Roman province, under Roman governors: the authority of the Sanhedrin was also greatly limited, and its functions restricted. That court did not possess legal authority to enforce their own sentence against Jesus; but were constrained to apply to Pilate to crucify him: and, after a few very short intervals, in which they recovered rather more authority, Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed; the whole civil and ecclesiastical government subverted and annihilated; the Jews dispersed as wanderers through the nations; and they have continued for almost 1750 years "without a king, and without a prince, and with-

"out a sacrifice, &c."[1]—'They have been for '1745 years, more destitute of sceptre, lawgiver, 'and every kind of legislative authority, than even 'during the Babylonish captivity.' This consideration so perplexed a learned Jew, above 700 years ago, that he wrote thus to his friend: 'I would 'fain learn from thee, out of the testimonies of 'the law and the prophets, and other scriptures, 'why the Jews are thus smitten in this captivity 'wherein they are; which may be properly called 'THE PERPETUAL ANGER OF GOD, because it hath 'no end. For it is now above 1000 years since we 'were carried captive by Titus; and yet our 'fathers, who worshipped idols, killed the prophets, 'and cast the law behind their back, were only 'punished with a seventy years captivity, and 'then brought home again; but now there is no 'end of our captivity, nor do the prophets promise 'any.—(*Bp. Patrick.*)

Every attempt of the Jews to shew that they have, or can have, a sceptre, or lawgiver, in their present dispersed state, only proves how reluctant they are to believe that Shiloh is come. But he is come; and Jesus is Shiloh: to him has the gathering of many peoples been, and soon I trust the Jews will be gathered to him; which "will be "as life from the dead" to all the nations of the earth.[2]

The word שֵׁבֶט signifies *a rod*, and in a very few instances it is used for *a rod of correction*.[3] Hence some modern Jews, would interpret the prediction thus, 'The rod of correction shall not depart from

[1] Hos. iii. 3, 4. [2] Rom. xi. 15. [3] Ps. lxxxix. 32. Lam. iii. 1.

'Judah—till Shiloh come.' But, wherever the word is thus used, God is indeed supposed to be the Agent, and man the instrument; but *sin* the procuring cause. In this place, however, it occurs in a prediction of Judah's pre-eminence and long continued prosperity; without the least intimation of any thing respecting either sin or correction: and its connection with the word *lawgiver* wholly excludes the interpretation, as entirely foreign to the subject. Indeed every student of such subjects should remember, that it is absurd to explain a single clause in a sentence to mean what is in all respects unsuitable to the rest of the sentence, or of the subject of which the writer is treating. It is, however, evident that the interpretation is adopted as a sort of forlorn hope, when the Jews are hard pressed with this prophecy, as to the time of the predicted coming of the Messiah.

II. The next passage of scripture which I shall adduce, in proof that the time fixed by the prophets for the coming of the Messiah is past, and has been so for many ages, is taken from the prophecy of Haggai. "For thus saith the Lord "of hosts; yet once it is a little while, and I will "shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, "and the dry land: and I will shake all nations, "and the desire of all nations shall come; and I "will fill this house with my glory, saith the "Lord of hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold "is mine, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory "of this latter house shall be greater than that of "the former, saith the Lord of hosts; and in this "place will I give peace, saith the Lord of

"hosts."[1] It is probable that modern Jews will refuse to admit this as a prediction of the Messiah: but, in that case, it becomes requisite that they should explicitly shew what events are predicted; and who is marked out by "the Desire "of all nations;" חֶמְדַּת *Desiderium, res desiderabilis, expetibilis, concupiscibilis.*[2] 'That which 'all nations would desire;' or, 'which would be 'desirable for all nations.' The seed of Abraham, in whom all "the families of the earth shall be "blessed."—The noun is singular, but the verb is plural; but perhaps the noun also should be plural. A plural noun from the same root is used concerning Daniel;[3] and rendered "Thou art "greatly beloved;" as the Roman emperor was called, *Deliciæ humani generis.* Some would render it, 'the desirable *things* of all nations.' The objections to this interpretation are, the great 'solemnity of the introduction, (6, 7,) and the 'impropriety of the language, "shall come;" when it should rather be said, "shall be brought." It may well be doubted whether the 'second 'temple could exceed that of Solomon, in the 'splendour and costliness of its ornaments. 'Pri-'deaux values the gold with which the holy of 'holies alone was overlaid, at four millions three 'hundred and twenty thousand pounds sterling. 'It seems to me, that supposing the Messiah to be 'prophecied of, greater precision in the language 'could not have been used.' (*Bp. Newcome.*)—Whoever compares the sixth chapter of the first

[1] Hag. ii. 6—9. Heb. xii. 26—29. Ps. cvi. 24. Jer. xii. 19. *Heb.*

[2] 2 Chron. xxi. 20.

[3] Dan. ix. 23.

book of Kings, with even the most splendid accounts of the second temple, however "adorned "with costly stones and gifts;" must perceive that the former, being overlaid in every part, even the very "floor with pure gold," had a glory *in this respect*, which was incomparably beyond that of the second temple, in its highest magnificence. So that nothing but the presence of the Messiah, such a Messiah as has already been spoken of under the preceding question, could possibly cause the second temple to exceed that of Solomon in glory.—Again, when Solomon's temple was dedicated, "the glory of the Lord "filled the house:"[1] but nothing of this kind occurred in respect of the second temple. By the statement of the Jews themselves, the second temple wanted many things which were the glory of Solomon's temple; especially the ark of the covenant and the mercy seat: and what occurred during its whole continuance to compensate and overbalance these deficiences, except the personal presence of Immanuel; "the effulgency of JEHO-"VAH'S glory, and the express image of his person?"

In this event, in this peculiar honour and distinction, "the glory of the latter house was greater "than that of the former;" and from Jerusalem, from that time, JEHOVAH gave *peace*, spiritual and eternal peace, to all of every nation, who believed in "the Prince of Peace," and embraced "the "gospel of peace."

It was, then, predicted, that the Messiah should come during the continuance of the second

[1] 2 Chron. vii. 1, 2.

temple: but that temple has been destroyed above 1740 years: therefore the Messiah is come; and Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, for he has no competitor.

III. In coincidence with Haggai, Malachi, the last of the Old Testament prophets, in the name of JEHOVAH, uses these words: "Behold I will "send my messenger; and he shall prepare my "way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, "shall suddenly come to his temple, even the "Messenger" (or Angel) "of the covenant, "whom ye delight in. Behold he shall come, "saith the Lord of hosts: but who may abide the "day of his coming?"[1] Can any man reasonably doubt whether the messenger here spoken of, as sent "to prepare the way of the Lord," be the same who is afterwards foretold under the name of Elijah?[2] When this herald had "prepared the "way, the Lord, whom the Jews sought, would "suddenly come to *his temple*." Who is this "Lord, who would come," not to the temple of another, not to the temple of JEHOVAH, but to *his own temple*? Who is He that is also "the Messenger of the covenant," as sent by another, for a special purpose? Who is he in whom the Jews, in prospect, "delighted," yet whose coming they could not "abide?" Whom did the Jews expect at that time? Whom have they ever since been seeking? Is not this the long-expected and desired Messiah? Beyond all doubt he is meant: yet he must come while the temple stood; and that temple has been de-

[1] Mal. iii. 1, 2.

[2] Mal. iv. 5. Isa. xl. 3, 4. Mark ix. 13. Luke i. 15—17, 76.

stroyed for above 1740 years! 'The person whose 'coming is so solemnly proclaimed, is described 'by the name of the Lord, הָאָדוֹן, the same whom 'David called his Lord,[1] (אֲדֹנִי) and he is the 'Lord of the temple, where he will make his ap-'pearance.'—'He shall choose this place to pub-'lish his doctrine, and to do many of his miracles:' (*Lowth:*) and also to exercise his authority, and manifest his glory.[2] This is no obscure prophecy: the outline is marked, and clear, and strong; and with that alone, in this place, we are concerned. The time fixed for its accomplishment has long since elapsed: so that either it has already been fulfilled, or it has failed of accomplishment. But, if it was not fulfilled in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, when and how has it received its completion? Till this is shewn, we must conclude, with unhesitating confidence, that the Messiah was predicted as coming, while the temple at Jerusalem was in existence; and that Jesus of Nazareth is He.

Grounded on these and similar predictions, it is well known that in all the eastern regions an expectation prevailed of some extraordinary person, who was about to arise and obtain dominion over the nations. '*Percrebuerat Oriente toto 'vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis ut eo tem-'pore Judeâ profecti rerum potirentur.*—An an-'cient and constant opinion had been spread 'abroad through all the east, that it was in the 'fates, that persons coming *at that time* out of 'Judea, should obtain the dominion.' (*Suetonius*)

[1] Psalm cx. 1. [2] Matt. xxi. 12—15. John ii. 14—21.

'*Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum* '*literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut vale-* '*sceret oriens, profectique Judea rerum potirentur.* 'A persuasion was in most men of its being con- 'tained in the ancient writings of the priests, that '*at that very time* it would be, that the east would 'become strong, and that persons coming out of 'Judea, would obtain the dominion.' (*Tacitus.*) It seems, that Vespasian, the Roman general in the east, who exercised authority in Judea, availed himself of this opinion, in his successful attempt to mount the imperial throne.—The expected Messiah, *at that very time*, was to the Jews ὁ Ερχόμενος, "He who cometh;" and the false Christs, or Messiahs, who began to arise about the same time, one after another, furnish a clear proof that, according to the computation of the *ancient* Jews, the predicted time for the appearing of the Messiah was arrived. The flatterers of Herod the Tetrarch are said to have considered him as the Messiah, and, as some suppose, they were on that account called Herodians.—Virgil has his Pollio, taken from the Sybilline books, which were manifestly derived from the prophecies of scripture concerning the Messiah; and all was either 'silent expectation,' or turbulent expectation, from a short time before the days of Jesus to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. Yet after so many revolving centuries no Messiah appears, unless Jesus was He! Various have been the devices of the Jews, to account for this delay; which only shews the perplexity to which it reduces them. Mr. C. says, that 'the end of any thing may be *shortened*.' (P. 67. l. 12.)

Some have thought that it might also be *lengthened*, and that 1800 years of delay, have been appointed as the punishment of their sins. But where do we find in scripture, that God either *lengthens* or *shortens* the term expressly marked out in any prediction? The deluge came, to a day, at the time previously appointed: Israel was rescued from Egypt on the very day before revealed to Abraham: and, the predicted seventy years of the Babylonish captivity being finished, the Jews were liberated and restored by the decree of Cyrus. All such evasions, therefore, are wholly inadmissible.

Mr. C. has repeatedly said, that Daniel's prophecy of seventy weeks 'is that which we rely 'on;' and that 'we have nothing else upon which 'we can rely.' But, in fact, I think it has been fully proved from the Old Testament, that the time fixed in prophecy for the coming of the Messiah has long since elapsed; and that the point is incontrovertible, apart from the existence of that prophecy. I must not, however, close this part of our subject, without calling the reader's attention to it: though the nature of this publication excludes that adequate consideration of it, which is requisite, in order to give the demonstration contained in it the full prominency to which it is entitled.

The solemn introduction to this extraordinary prediction, consisting of Daniel's fasting, and most fervent prayer for his people; and the Lord's sending to him the angel Gabriel, to assure him that his prayer was heard; and that he was "greatly beloved;" with the design on which

Gabriel came, to cause him to "understand the "matter and consider the vision:" all these things combine to shew that events of no ordinary importance were about to be revealed.

The general term of seventy weeks is dated in Daniel, not from the destruction of the first temple, as Mr. C. repeatedly states; (p. 88. l. 21—23. p. 88. l. 21, 22;) but "from the going "forth of the commandment to restore and to "build Jerusalem." This should be particularly noticed: and it hence becomes needful to inquire, What *decree*, or *commandment*, noticed in scripture, is that referred to in the prophecy? for they were all future when Gabriel spoke to Daniel. The decree of Cyrus related merely to the rebuilding of the temple.[1] That of Darius only confirmed and explained that decree.[2] The commission given by Artaxerxes to Ezra did not indeed directly contain any thing about restoring and building Jerusalem.[3] But the commission granted to Nehemiah, in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, was expressly "a commandment to "restore and to build Jerusalem." So he understood it; and accordingly he rebuilded the walls, and provided for the fortification and replenishing of the city, and defending it against invaders, with the greatest earnestness; not at all intimidated by the reports which were spread concerning his designs.[4] These considerations have induced some learned men to date the seventy weeks, from Artaxerxes's commission to Nehemiah; but

[1] Ezra i. 1—4.
[2] Ezra vi.
[3] Ezra vii.
[4] Neh. ii. iv. vi.

the chronology does not easily admit of it. The commission indeed to Ezra was not explicit about the rebuilding of the city and its walls: yet the expressions used in Daniel may be understood figuratively, and include the resettling of the whole estate of the Jews, civil and ecclesiastical, which was begun by Ezra, and carried on and completed by Nehemiah. It is therefore, at present, the general opinion of learned men, that the decree spoken of to Daniel by Gabriel is that granted by Artaxerxes to Ezra, in the seventh year of his reign. This commission to Ezra, whence the seventy weeks should be dated, was granted about four hundred and fifty-seven years before the Christian era. The "seventy weeks" are divided into three parts; "seven weeks," "sixty-"two weeks," and "one week." The first seven weeks, or forty-nine years, are generally allotted for the execution of the decree "to restore and to "build Jerusalem:" and in about that time, the walls and fortifications of Jerusalem were completed; her streets and houses rebuilded; and the city replenished with inhabitants, as in ancient times. This leads us to four hundred and eight years before the Christian era; but this era commences, as it is generally agreed, four years after the birth of Jesus. "Sixty-two weeks," from this time, brings the calculation to A. D. 26, or the thirtieth year of our Lord's age. It is immaterial in this argument, whether the words, "The street "shall be built again, and the wall, even in "troublous times," be connected with the "seven "weeks," during which that work was performed; or with the "sixty-two weeks," during which

Jerusalem, amidst turbulent times, and various revolutions, continued a fortified city, previously to the entrance of our Lord on his public ministry; which seems to have taken place, exactly at the end of the sixty-two weeks, when he was thirty years of age.[1] Minute exactness is not requisite in such computations, and learned men, who agree in the grand outline, vary a little in subordinate matters; but this was at least nearly the case. The continuance of our Lord's ministry, till his crucifixion, is likewise differently computed: but, on every computation, he was crucified during the continuance of the "last "week," and after the end of the "sixty and two "weeks."—The longer the part of the time is which we allot to his ministry, the less remains for those events which took place soon after his resurrection. Some compute that he expired on the cross in the last year of the seventy weeks; and some, that it was in the middle of the seventieth week; induced by the clause "in the midst "of the week, he shall cause the sacrifice and "oblation to cease:" but whether this, "He shall "confirm the covenant with many for one week," be understood of the term of John the Baptist's ministry, and afterwards of our Lord's till his death; or whether it take in the first successes of the gospel, after his resurrection, we come nearly to the same point: and as near, as the purposed obscurity of prediction; previously to its completion, allows us to expect.

Mr. C. indeed thinks it, and probably the Jews

[1] Luke iii. 23.

in general think it, incumbent on us to shew, that the seventy weeks reached to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple; because *in fact* the oblation did not cease till that catastrophe: and then indeed we might be reduced to some expedient similar to the 'shortening the end of a 'thing;' but we are under no necessity of having recourse to so desperate a measure. If Jesus be the Messiah, (and, if this prophecy *relate to the Messiah*, that question is decided,) then our interpretation of its language must be taken from Christianity. Now Christians consider, and must consider, all the typical sacrifices and oblations as *virtually* abolished, when the one great Sacrifice for sin had been offered. They might be *tolerated*, and attended on by Jewish converts to Christianity, as a matter of expediency, and till they better understood their Christian liberty; but they ceased to be "shadows of good things to "come," instituted acts of worship, and 'means 'of grace.' *Commemoration* immediately succeeded to *prefiguration:* Christian ordinances to Jewish: and from the time when Jesus expired on the cross, "when the veil of the temple was "rent from the top to the bottom," the dispensation of the Messiah superseded that of Moses. Sacrifice and oblation ceased, as required or accepted by God, from those who neglected the salvation of Christ, and the whole became as a cancelled bond.[1]

This was not, indeed, fully understood, for some time, even by the first preachers of Christianity;

[1] Col. ii. 14.

and, if we adopt the opinion of those who compute, that the last week of the seventy reached till two or three years after the death of Jesus; till his gospel had been fully offered to the Jews as a nation, and rejected by them; or till the gentiles began to be admitted into the Christian church; our general conclusion will not be in the least affected. From this period, *according to Christianity*, the Jews, as such, ceased to be the people of God, who now "called his people by another "name."[1] The nation was from that time left in the condition of a condemned criminal; yet "the "long-suffering of God waited, as in the days of "Noah," that individuals "might save themselves "from that untoward generation." Of this long-suffering many tens and hundreds of thousands availed themselves: but, when the time predicted by our Lord arrived, before "that generation had "passed away," the term of God's long-suffering having expired, he fulfilled the rest of Daniel's prophecy: "And the people of the prince, that "shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanc-"tuary; and the end thereof shall be with a "flood; and to the end of the war desolations are "determined." "The overspreading of abom-"ination shall make it desolate, even until the "consummation, and that determined shall be "poured upon the desolate." Then the *virtual* abolition of the sacrifice and oblation became *actual;* yea, the observance of the law of sacrifices became impracticable, as it has now been for above 1700 years. But no date is in the pro-

[1] Isaiah lxv. 15. Acts xi. 26.

phecy explicitly fixed to any event subsequent to Messiah's death, and the "confirming of his cove-"nant with many."

It would be wholly unsuitable to the object of this publication, to enter, critically and fully, into the expressions used by the angel Gabriel in the twenty-fourth verse.[1] Perhaps to "finish the "transgression" means, the commission of that crime by the Jewish nation, as the counsel of their rulers, scribes, and priests, adopted by the people, (when, demanding the crucifixion of Jesus, they exclaimed, "His blood be on us and on our "children;[2]) by which the measure of their guilt was filled up: for the original word is not used by Moses for any of the legal sacrifices. "To "make an end of sin," or of sin-offering, (as the word is often used) evidently means, to abrogate the laws of sin-offerings. "To make reconcilia-"tion for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righ-"teousness," can mean nothing less, than to offer that atonement, and finish that righteousness, by which all the people of the Messiah should be pardoned, reconciled to God, justified, made holy, and eternally saved. "To seal up the vision and "prophecy," or "the Prophet," means, to fulfil, and seal as accomplished, all the visions and predictions of the prophets concerning the Messiah, and to *seal* him as the prophet of the new dispensation; "For him hath God the Father "sealed."[3] "And to anoint the most holy," either the "Holy One of God," or the true "holy

[1] Mr. C. in quoting Daniel's prophecy, has wholly omitted three out of the five verses of which it consists.

[2] Matt. xxvii. 25. [3] John vi. 27.

" of holies;" of which that of the tabernacle, consecrated by anointing, was a type and shadow.[1] It is not material to our argument, whether the very best interpretation of all the clauses is here adopted, or not; and I am very willing that others should interpret some of them differently: but, however interpreted, they must all have had their fulfilment in the Messiah here predicted; for the time has long since expired: as also must the clauses, "He shall confirm the covenant with "many for one week," and "he shall cause the "sacrifice and oblation to cease."—Mr. C. stops in his quotation at the end of the 26th verse; but the reader's attention must be called to the concluding verse: "And he shall confirm the cove-"nant with many for one week: and in the midst "of the week he shall cause the oblation to cease, "and for the overspreading of abominations he "shall make it desolate, even until the consum-"mation, and that determined shall be poured "upon the desolate."[2] It is obvious to consider "Messiah the Prince" as the person spoken of, who would do all these things. JEHOVAH is not mentioned; and it is not easy to conceive in what sense the Roman emperor, of whom some would interpret it, could be said "to confirm the cove-"nant with many for one week." But I here only draw the reader's attention to the language; the prophecy will come before us on other topics, when some of the expressions will be more fully considered. At present we must keep to the main argument; namely, to prove that the Mes-

[1] Ex. xxx. 23—26. xl. 9. Heb. ix. 22—25. [2] Dan. ix. 27.

siah was to come before the destruction of the second temple.

Is then the Messiah predicted by all the prophets here intended, or is some other person? The words, "Messiah the Prince," are in fact more explicit than those used in any other part of scripture. Nothing can be more natural and easy than the application of every clause to Jesus Christ, according to the New Testament: but, if a Jew (as he must, continuing a Jew,) reject this application, let him shew in whom not only one or two clauses may *seem* to have been fulfilled; but in whom, and in what events, each part and expression of the prophecy, without exception, received its accomplishment.

We may now close this part of the argument, by briefly adverting to what Mr. C. has advanced against the Christian interpretation. (P. 18. l. 3.) That which relates to the seventy weeks, and the time when Messiah should be cut off, has been fully considered. Jesus was crucified at the time predicted, and the several consequences followed, as foretold by the prophet.

P. 19. l. 8. 'Not one of the apostles,' &c The apostles adduced those parts of the Old Testament which their argument required: but they never professed to bring forward every prediction of the Messiah contained in it. Several, even of those which the Jews allow to have been spoken of the Messiah, are not quoted: so that their silence is no proof that 'they could not have thought of 'such a thing.' But there might be special rea-

sons for their conduct as to this prophecy. Nothing so irritated the minds of the Jews in those days, as the declaration that the temple would be destroyed, and its worship terminated, according to the predictions of the crucified Jesus [1] No prophecy so clearly predicted these events, and so connected them with the "Messiah, the Prince "being cut off," as this of Daniel: the apostles could allege and expound prophecies in abundance to prove their point without it: it was their object to convince, not to exasperate: and most of the New Testament was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. This prophecy is however referred to in the gospels; [2] and it must be included in those prophecies which Mr. C. afterwards mentions, as proofs that Jesus was not a prophet, but only repeated the prophecies of the Old Testament. (P. 90.)

P. 19. l. 15. 'We read,' &c. Whatever objection a Christian may have to the criticism of this passage, he can have none to the conclusion deduced; 'Messiah, which means the king, "shall "be cut off," and not *to him*, וְאֵין לוֹ; that is, he 'shall have no successor.' For the Messiah, when "cut off out of the land of the living;" when JEHOVAH made his soul an "offering for sin," yea, "because he poured out his soul unto death; saw "his seed, and prolonged his days, and the plea-"sure of the Lord prospered in his hands." [3] Thus Jesus arose from the dead, ascended into heaven, reigns over all worlds, 'has no suc-

[1] Acts vi. 13, 14. xxi. 28.

[2] Comp. Dan. ix. 27. with Matt. xxiv. 15. Mark. xiii. 14. Luke xxi. 20. [3] Is. liii. 8, 10, 12.

'cessor;' but "must reign till all enemies be put "under his feet."[1] I do not think this the meaning of the clause; but, waving this, on Mr. C.'s interpretation, it clearly marks Jesus as the promised Messiah.—'By which is pointed out, 'that there shall be no more kingly power in the 'Jewish nation.' "The sceptre was departed from "Judah, and a lawgiver from between his feet:" "Shiloh was come; and to him," ever since, "the gathering of the peoples has been."

P. 19. l. 24. 'This Messiah that was to be cut 'off was king Agrippa.'—'Agrippa was of the 'stock of Abraham, and king over Israel.' (P. 20. l. 1.)—King Agrippa was a descendent of Herod, who was of 'the stock of Edom,' but a proselyte to Judaism. At the death of his father Herod,[2] Judea became again a Roman province; but after some years the Emperor Claudius made Agrippa king of Chalcis; and afterwards gave him the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias; namely, Iturea, Trachonitis, and Abilene: all these regions were without the boundaries of the promised land. But Nero, along with some towns in Perea, gave him part of Galilee. Agrippa also possessed some authority, as deputy of the Roman emperors, over the treasury of the temple, and the succession of the high priesthood: and he seems to have used this authority in deposing and advancing the high priests, without regard to the law of God. But Felix, and Festus, and other Roman governors, exercised the whole civil authority in Judea all the while. In what sense then was Agrippa, 'of

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 25. [2] Acts xii. 23.

'the stock of Abraham, and king over Israel?' How could he be called "Messiah the Prince," by way of emphasis and distinction? Or how can the several parts of the prophecy be applied to him?

My scanty library does not give me the means of ascertaining in what manner Agrippa was cut off. It seems from Josephus, that he was connected with the Romans and with their armies, in the beginning of that war which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem; but afterwards we read nothing concerning him. As to 'his son Monves,' I own I never before read his name. I cannot find it in the Roman historians, or in Josephus. I suspect, from the formation of the word, that it is taken from the Rabbinical writers; and I should be glad to be informed, on what authority this part of the narrative rests. It is clear, however, that both the death of Agrippa, and every thing relative to his son Monves, are almost overlooked by historians. If it had not been for Josephus, and for the writer of the Acts of the apostles, even king Agrippa would scarcely have been known to posterity. And can it be conceived, that such an obscure, petty, dependent prince, ruling by the courtesy of the emperors over a part of Galilee, and some adjacent regions inhabited by gentiles, (while Judea was ruled by Roman governors,) was "Messiah the Prince;" and that his obscure death, and that of his son, were the events intended by the Holy Spirit, in this prophecy, which is introduced with such solemnity, and concludes with such awful denunciations of judgments on the Jews? It does not even appear that the slaughter

of Agrippa had any *political* connexion with these judgments: and, being the act of the Romans, could not be the *deserving cause* of them before God.

Indeed, this (as far as I can learn) *new* interpretation is a confession of the insuperable difficulties, to which Daniel's prophecy reduces all those who refuse to own Jesus, as "Messiah the "Prince."

P. 20. l. 3. 'Thus far,' &c. It is not difficult or uncommon for men to boast of victories which they have not obtained; and with such evident complacency, as shews that they really think they have obtained them.

P. 20. l. 6. 'The coming of the Messiah until 'this day is unknown.' Mr. C. has, however, bestowed considerable pains in the subsequent pages, to ascertain this unknown 'mystery.' In fact, scarcely any predictions in the scripture are so clearly dated, as those which relate to the coming of the Messiah. This has already been shewn. The reader must judge in what way the two texts, adduced in proof of this assertion, bear at all on the subject. In the first, (l. 9.) the Messiah returning from the slaughter of his enemies, represented by Edom, says, "For the day of vengeance "is in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is "come." He had had it long at heart to execute vengeance on his enemies, and to rescue his people, and the fixed time was at length arrived. Nothing is said of the coming of the Messiah, but of his victory over his enemies. Whatever God *determines*, whether revealed or concealed, is "in his "heart:" and the time being come implies that it

was no longer concealed.[1] In the second, (l. 21,) Daniel was 'longing to know,' not 'the coming of the Messiah,' as Mr. C. asserts, (l. 25,) of whom no mention is made; but when God "should "have accomplished to scatter the power of the "holy people,"[2] that is, the time of the gathering of Israel from their dispersions, their conversion to Christ, their restoration, and the final triumphs of the gospel: and even of these events the prophet had received such clear revelations, as have been a clew and guide to the expositors of prophecy, in every subsequent age; though they could not fully understand every thing respecting it.

P. 20. l. 28. 'The Messiah is not yet come. 'We must look,' &c. This whole passage (p. 20—26,) is a mixture of scriptural truth; of human traditions, which are not entitled to the least credit; and of inaccuracies of little consequence.

P. 21. l. 4. 'The third,' &c.—The kingdom of the Messiah is afterwards stated to be 'absolutely 'earthly,' (p. 53—57,) and is such a kingdom, perfect, and to 'endure for evermore?'

P. 21. l. 25. 'Angels could give no names,' &c. Angels did not give names to the animals, for they were not directed to do it: but we have no reason to conclude from any thing revealed in the Old Testament, that man was ever superior to angels, or equal to them: man also was created with a material body, angels are immaterial spirits. Our main argument, however, is no ways affected by the opinion.—Again, we are not informed what Satan was when God created Adam: we only

[1] Is. lxiii. 1—6. [2] Daniel xii. 7, 8.

know, that, concealed in the serpent, he tempted and ruined our first parents, and all their posterity in them.

P. 22. l. 11. 'Six thousand years,—but no 'longer.' Mr. C. has then discovered 'the un-'known mystery:' for 'this last period will com-'mence with the coming of the Messiah.' (P. 21.) He will come then exactly at the end of the six thousand years from the creation: and it is not difficult to compute those years, principally from the Old Testament. The present is about 5818: and one hundred and eighty-two years, or about that time, will complete the six thousand years. Six thousand years, however, from the creation, either as the time of the coming of the Messiah, or to the millennium, is no where stated in scripture: yet many Christians have conjectured, that the millennium will begin at the end of six thousand years; and argued for it with considerable plausibility.—But this has not the least relation to the coming of the Messiah; and is no more than a remote consequence of that event.

P. 22. l. 19. 'Of what use would his coming be?' —It must appear to every real Christian, that the coming of a Messiah, to establish an 'absolutely 'earthly kingdom,' can never be of much use to sinful dying men; but, as Mr. C. repeats this question afterwards, I shall endeavour, once for all, to give it a distinct answer. Corruption admits of degrees; and it might be of some use for the Messiah to come, even if only to render the world far less corrupt than it otherwise would have been.

P. 22. l. 25. 'The new world will commence,' &c. It will commence at the end of 6000 years

from the creation, and with the coming of the Messiah.[1] On this ground, the time of the Messiah's coming, so far from being unknown, never 'told to any of the prophets,' 'never revealed;' (p. 20.) is known beforehand with an unexampled certainty and exactness.

P. 22. l. 30. 'Mankind will be above the angels.' —Some Christians have collected an opinion of this kind, from the relation in which the redeemed stand to Immanuel, and from the revelation of St. John;[1] but not a hint of the kind is given in the Old Testament.—It does not appear, how this most exalted view of 'the new world under the Messiah' can consist with his kingdom 'being absolutely earthly,' or with the view given in the subsequent pages of the state of the gentiles (that is, of an immense majority of the inhabitants of the earth,) under the reign of Messiah.

P. 23. l. 4. 'The Messiah is not yet come. 'We are assured,' &c. Isaiah, in the text referred to, says, "The Redeemer shall come to Zion: and "unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, "saith the Lord. As for me, this is my covenant "with them, saith the Lord, &c." With whom? Not with Israel, as a nation, but "*with them that "turn from transgression in Jacob.*" But how will it be with those who "do not turn from trans-"gression in Jacob?"—Let us, however, hear in what way the apostle quotes it from the Septuagint: "There shall come out of Zion, the Deliv-"erer, and shall turn away ungodliness from "Jacob; for this is my covenant with them, when

[1] Rev. iv. 4. v. 9—14.

"I shall take away their sins."[1] When the Deliverer, or Redeemer shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob; then he will "take away their sins," by forgiveness, confirm his covenant with them, and so "all Israel shall be saved." But, till ungodliness is taken away, this will not be the case. Thus, in coincidence with all the prophecies of Israel's restoration, that event is connected with their conversion from sin and ungodliness; not with the coming of the Messiah, which is *not once mentioned* in connexion with their restoration.[2] The subject, on which the apostle was discoursing, shewed that he had in prospect Israel's receiving Jesus as their Messiah and Saviour: indeed, not the coming of the Messiah, but believing in him, is effectual for the blotting out of sin, either of Jew or gentile: and how can the author persuade himself, or hope to persuade others, that the apostle meant by one line in a quotation, to contradict and disprove that fact, which he spent and ended his life, in unremitted labours and sufferings, to render universally credited, viz. that the Messiah was come, and that Jesus the Nazarene was the Messiah? Or how does all this accord with Mr. C.'s opinion, concerning the absolutely earthly kingdom of the Messiah; and that the Messiah will not forgive sins? (See, on l. 19.)

P. 23. l. 24. 'That the Messiah is not yet come,' &c. There is not one word in the quotation from Leviticus, or in the whole passage, concerning the

[1] Is. lix. 20, 21. Rom. xi. 26, 27.

[2] Lev. xxvi. 41, 42. Deut. iv. 29, 30. xxx. 1—10. Jer. xxxii. 39—41. Ez. xi. 17—20. xxxvi. 24—28. xxxvii. 23—28. Hos. iii. 4, 5. xiv. 1—8. Zech. xii. 10—12.

Messiah; so that nothing can be inferred from it respecting his coming. The crisis in the condition of Israel is never stated to be "the coming of the "Messiah;" but "their uncircumcised hearts "being humbled;" which implies their repentance and conversion, and their receiving in humble faith that Saviour, whom they have pierced. Could Christians produce no better proof that the Messiah is come, than Mr. C. does that he is not come, their cause would be hopeless.

P. 24. l. 7. 'Here you may learn,' &c. Whence may we learn these things? Not a word is said either about the first or the second temple, or even the tabernacle, or the coming of the Messiah, in any of the texts referred to. I suppose the word often referred to, (מִקְדָּשִׁים) in our version rendered "sanctuaries," by Mr. C. translated *temples*, contains the *argument*; but it is used in the *plural*, when only one temple could be meant, if at all included;[1] of the sanctuaries of Tyre;[2] of the idol temples of the kingdom of Israel;[3] and in a variety of other senses.—Nothing therefore can be inferred from this single word. In fact, if the two temples exclusively had been meant, the dual number would most properly have been used.

Israel may "pine away in their iniquities," as well for the guilt of "crucifying afresh," from age to age, the promised Messiah, by impenitent unbelief and determined opposition, as for any other of their national sins: and, as the nation

[1] Ps. lxxiii. 17. Ezek. xxi. 2.
[2] Ezek. xxviii. 18.
[3] Amos vii. 9.

has not during many ages been guilty of gross idolatry, this seems an obvious reason of their long-continued abject situation. If this be the case, welcoming in penitent faith this long-rejected Saviour must be the introduction to their restoration.—And, if this be not the guilt for which God so permanently contends with them, (as I am most fully convinced it is,) let them assign a more adequate and satisfactory reason for the unprecedented dealings of the Lord with their favoured nation, during above seventeen hundred years.

P. 24. l. 11. 'The first covenant, will be remembered,' &c. How does this agree with the words of the prophets?[1]—'The first covenant,' however, was not that made at mount Sinai, but that made with Abraham, "which the law that was four "hundred and thirty years after could not dis-"annul."[2] Mr. C. has indeed quoted the forty-fifth verse of Leviticus xxvi., which seems to refer to the Sinai covenant; but he has omitted several preceding verses, which should not be unnoticed. "If they shall confess their iniquity, and the ini-"quity of their fathers, with their trespass which "they have trespassed against me, and that also "they have walked contrary unto me; and that "I have walked contrary unto them, and have "brought them into the land of their enemies; if "then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, "and they then accept of the punishment of their "iniquity: then will I remember my covenant "with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac,

[1] Jer. xxxi. 31—34. Ezek. xvi. 62. [2] Gal. iii. 15—29.

"and also my covenant with Abraham will I re-
"member, and I will remember the land."[1]

P. 24. l. 25. 'How came the prophet to take 'notice of Edom?' Answer: The Edomites hated Israel, and exulted over the desolations of Jerusalem and the miseries of the Jews, with mingled cruelty and scorn.[2] It was, therefore, natural for Jeremiah, when mourning over these desolations and miseries, to think of the Edomites: and it pleased God to employ him to foretel, that judgment from the wrath of God would ere long overtake these insulting foes, and that the Jews would soon return from captivity, and be reinstated in prosperity. Edom is indeed sometimes used as a general name for the enemies of God's people: but, whether it be in this place or not, it is certain that not one word occurs in it concerning the Messiah, or the time of his coming. It is also obvious to remark, that if *Edom* be the general name of the enemies of the people of God, of whatever nation; *Israel* also is the general name of God's people, though of other nations. Mr. C., I suppose, considers *Edom* as the proper title of the Roman empire, in every form. If I misunderstand him, he must set me right. But, however this may be, or whether his reasoning concerning Israel remaining a prisoner, 'so long 'as Edom is master,' be logical and well-grounded or not; it is manifest that a portion of scripture, in which the Messiah is not hinted at, can prove nothing either way concerning the time of his

[1] Lev. xxvi. 40—42.

[2] Ps. cxxxvii. 7. Jer. xlix. 7—22. Ezek. xxv. 8—14. xxxv. Amos i. 11, 12. Obad. 1—16.

coming; except to those who have *unscripturally* associated the ideas of his coming with 'the re-'storation of Israel:' and, as fact proves that Israel is not restored, no further proof can be requisite *to such persons:* but 'an honest man,' (p. 25. l. 22.) having well considered this argument, may think with me, that it has no relation at all to the present subject.

P. 25. l. 32. 'Five hundred years before Christ.' The Lamentations were written after the destruction of the first temple; the second was not destroyed till above seventy years after the birth of Jesus: yet Mr. C. in other places, computes that no more than 490 years occurred between the one and the other! (P. 88.)

P. 25. l. 34. 'He could do no good to Israel.' Jesus did good to many ten thousands of Jews, personally and by his apostles: but what physician can do good to an obstinate patient, who not only rejects his advice and his medicines, but also—*fit pugil, et medicum urget?—becomes a boxer, and fights his physician?*

P. 26. l. 12. 'Proof from the gospel,' &c. This is a vain attempt to make the gospel destructive of itself. It would be indeed most wonderful, if Jesus, who before Caiaphas and Pontius Pilate avowed himself the Messiah, and who was crucified for that avowal, should be found just before to testify that he was not the Messiah! (l. 26.) But this is not the only instance in which our Lord is introduced as renouncing the claims which he was crucified for advancing. Mr. C. has it fully settled in his own mind, that the coming of the Messiah and the restoration of Israel must

occur at the same time: and thus he is every where led to assume, as self-evident, the very point which he ought to prove.

Our Lord's claim to be a Prophet will come under consideration in another place. At present the expression, "until the times of the gentiles be "fulfilled," may require a brief consideration.

WHAT WE ARE TO UNDERSTAND BY "THE TIMES OF THE GENTILES."

Considerable weight is laid on these words; and Mr. C. takes for granted that they mean, 'until the measure of the iniquities of the gentiles 'shall be full:' (l. 30—34.) but they appear to me to admit of a very different interpretation.—Ἄχρι πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν; "Until the times of the "nations shall be accomplished," or, "shall have been fulfilled." No expression, at all resembling this, occurs in the Old Testament; or even in the New, except that of the apostle in the Epistle to the Romans:[1] Ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ; "Until the time when the fulness of the nations "shall come in." When the times shall arrive for the fulness of the gentiles to be brought into the church, "the blindness," which "in part has "happened to Israel," shall be removed, "and so "all Israel shall be saved."[2] This, or somewhat to this effect, is the evident meaning of the apostle: and from his argument it may be concluded, at least with great probability, that, according to his views, the conversion and resto-

[1] Rom. xi. 25. [2] Rom. xi. 25—31. 2 Cor. iii. 13—16.

ration of Israel will occur nearly at the time, when in the purpose of God, "the fulness of the "nations" shall become the subjects of Jesus Christ: and that the conversion of Israel, occurring at this crisis, shall introduce that grand display of the power, and truth, and mercy of God: and be "as life from the dead" to the nations of the world, and be one grand means of accomplishing it. Certainly the apostle meant the *conversion* of the nations? and there can be little doubt that the words of our Lord had reference to the same.—Till that period shall arrive, "Jerusalem shall" continue "trodden under foot of the gentiles."

I do not deny that the restoration of Israel will be preceded, and attended, by most tremendous judgments on many nations. In this the prophecies both of the Old and New Testament agree.[1] 'The restoration of Israel' will, no doubt, be one grand part of the Messiah's triumph over the beast, the false prophet, and the old serpent.[2] Besides antichristian opponents, the Mohammedans and idolaters, in Canaan and in the east, will no doubt vehemently oppose the reinstatement of Israel in the promised land; as the Canaanites did in the days of Joshua, and with the same event. But these dreadful scenes will be of no very long duration, and will introduce "the "times of the gentiles;" or the conversion of all nations to Christianity. Among the converts to our holy religion, Israel will assuredly have a peculiar prëeminence, as the nation through which God has blessed all other nations: not, as they vainly

[1] Ez. xxxviii. xxxix. 1—16. Joel iii. [2] Rev. xix. 11—21.

dream, by ruling over them with haughty dominion; which they will cease to desire, when they fully experience the loving spirit of Christianity: but by the willing honour, and grateful deference, rendered them by their fellow Christians: Then they will understand and enter into the apostle's meaning; "There is neither Jew "nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there "is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in "Christ Jesus."[1]

'"The times of the gentiles" seem to signify 'the times, during which the gentiles are per-'mitted to keep possession of Jerusalem; namely, 'till the Jews be converted unto Christ: then 'their times will be fulfilled; probably the Jews 'will be restored to their own land, and vengeance 'will be executed on those who oppose their 'return. For these events seem to be predicted, 'introductory to the calling of the nations into 'the church. Or, the times appointed for the 'calling of the gentiles, or all nations, into the 'church, may be meant. When this draweth 'nigh, the Jews will recover their holy city.'[2]

Nothing can be more clear than that such a time is foretold throughout the Old Testament. I shall not, in this place, anticipate a question which will soon come under our consideration: but let the reader carefully consider the texts referred to below;[3] and he must be convinced,

[1] Gal. iii. 26—29. [2] Scott's Bible, on Luke xxi. 20—24.

[3] Gen. xii. 3. xxii. 18. Ps. xxii, 27. lxxii. 17. Is. ii. 1—4. xix. 24, 25. lx. Jer. xvi. 19. Mic. iv. 1—4. Mal. i. 11.

I should think, that the times of the gentiles in this sense may confidently be expected: for "the "scripture cannot be broken." Whether this conversion of the nations to the worship of the God of Israel shall be by their being proselyted to Judaism, as the Jews sometimes appear to admit, or by their conversion to Christianity, may with many persons be a matter of doubt: but the predictions are undeniable: and the times when these shall be fulfilled are "the times of "the gentiles; and not the times when the gentiles, at large, shall be destroyed, or crushed, which is no where foretold by the prophets. On the contrary, after several predictions of dreadful judgments on this or the other nation, it is added; "Yet will I bring again the captivity of Moab "in the latter days." The same is said of Ammon and of Elam.[1] The times are coming, not when Judah shall rule with an iron rod over all nations, but when all nations shall be gathered to Judah's SHILOH; receive from Judah "the oracles of God;" worship, and serve, and bless themselves, in the God of Israel; and honour and love Israel as the chief nation on earth, and the source of blessings to all other nations. And surely it might be thought that this would be more gratifying even to Jews, than their present expectations of lordly dominion: and certainly it will be so, when the Lord shall "circumcise their heart to "love him with all their heart." Then prëeminence in love, and gratitude, and honour, from

[1] Jer. xlviii. 47. xlix. 6. 39.

all the happy partakers of their own Messiah's reign, will be far more delightful to them than any worldly superiority.

P. 27. l. 8. "This declaration,' &c. The apostle, in the passage here in part quoted, is most undeniably speaking of the eternal judgment of individuals, whether Jews or gentiles.[1] The Jew, "who is contentious, and does not obey the truth, "but obeys unrighteousness," will have the first and largest portion "of tribulation and anguish;" but the believing and obedient Jews, the first and largest portion of glory and honour, "in the day "when God shall judge the secrets of men by "Jesus Christ." This is the apostle's express meaning; and the passage has nothing to do, in the least, with the state of Jews and gentiles, as to this present world. The degree, whether of anguish or of glory, and not the priority in time, is intended; for both will be *eternal*.

P. 27. l. 20. 'You see,' &c. The texts referred to below, may shew how Jesus and his apostles understood his predictions on this subject.[2]

P. 28. l. 2. 'Not one of the gentiles' &c. It is an attempt requiring no ordinary measure of *heroism*, for a man to undertake to prove, *from the New Testament* that none but Jews would be the servants of God! The ancient Jews had no

[1] Rom. ii. 4—16.

[2] Matt. xxi. 33—46. xxiii. 34—39. xxiv. 15—22. Luke xix. 41—44. xx. 15—18. xxi. 20—24. Acts iii. 22, 23. iv. 10—12. 25—28. vii. 37—53. xiii. 40, 41. xxviii. 23—28. Rom. ix. 1—3. 24—33. 1 Thes. ii. 13—16. Jam. v. 1—6.

idea of an attempt of this kind. It is far from certain that the Jewish converts are exclusively intended by the hundred and forty-four thousand, who were sealed as the servants of God, "out of "all the tribes of the children of Israel;" it being improbable, in the highest degree, that there should be *exactly* the same number out of each tribe. The innumerable multitude "of all nations, "and kindreds, and people, and tongues," who are afterwards mentioned, are not said to have been *sealed*, and so Mr. C. excludes them from the title, "the servants of God."—It is, however, said in the subsequent verses, "these are they, which "came out of great tribulation, and have washed "their robes, and made them white in the blood "of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the "throne of God, and *serve him* day and night in "his temple:[1] and he that sitteth on the throne "shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no "more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the "sun light on them, nor any heat. For the "Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall "feed them, and shall lead them unto living foun-"tains of waters: and God shall wipe away all "tears from their eyes."[2] If we, poor sinners of the gentiles, may attain such felicity as this, we shall need no other honour.

Much of what follows is *assertion:* part we assent to, and part we dissent from. But the great point in controversy, respecting Jesus, (Whether he be the predicted Messiah, or whether some other is to be expected,) is not con-

[1] Rev. xxii. 2—4. [2] Rev. vii. 9—17. Is. xxv. 6—8.

cerned in the interpretation, well or ill-grounded, of the texts adduced; and therefore I shall not further notice them.

P. 28. l. 18. 'Now when,' &c. The prophecy of Zechariah, here in part quoted, has been shewn, by the author of these remarks, to have had a *partial*, yet *illustrious*, fulfilment in the days of the apostles, and in the succeeding ages: but, that it will have a still more enlarged and glorious accomplishment, when God shall restore Israel, and make the Israelites his willing instruments in converting the gentile world.[1] An extract from the sermon referred to may here be properly introduced.—'The conquerors and destroyers of 'the Jews have become the worshippers of the 'God of the Jews. JEHOVAH has superseded 'Jupiter, and all the other pagan deities, through 'the vast dominions of the Greeks and Romans; 'not to dwell on the utter extinction of the ancient 'idolatry of Chaldea, Persia, and Egypt. The 'Lord has "famished all the gods of the earth; 'and men worship him, every one from his place, 'even all the isles of the heathen."[2] The God of 'the Jews, long unknown, except to that obscure 'and oppressed people, is now the professed object 'of worship, throughout the mightiest and most 'distinguished nations on earth. This is a fact 'that cannot be denied or doubted. But in what 'way and by what means was it effected? "Not 'by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith 'the Lord of hosts." "Ten men shall take hold,

[1] Sermon preached before the London Society, entitled, 'The Jews a blessing to the nations.' See vol. vi. p. 87. of this edition.

[2] Zeph. ii. 11.

'out of all the languages of the nations, even 'shall take hold of the skirt of him who is a Jew, 'saying, We will go with you, for we have heard 'that God is with you."' Compulsion was not one of the means employed: the conduct of the persons here stated was the effect of conviction.— 'The Redeemer was a Jew; all his apostles were 'Jews, all the seventy disciples, and all the first 'evangelists, or missionaries to the gentiles; yea, 'and all the first converts to Christianity, who, 'dispersed into various parts of the world, carried 'among the gentiles the word of salvation, were 'Jews!—At the lowest computation, each Jew, 'converted to Christianity, won over ten idolaters 'to "lay hold on his skirt, and to say, We will 'go with you; for we have heard that God is with 'you."'

P. 28. l. 23. 'Where is the boasting,' &c. I believe no real Christian boasts or glories over the Jews: by the gospel, "boasting is excluded;" compassion and good-will, yea, a kind of respect and gratitude to the Jews, as a nation, must spring from genuine Christianity: nor is the sentiment, of glorying over the Jews, common even among nominal Christians.

P. 28. l. 25. 'By the witness,' &c.—L. 32. 'Here he appointed,' &c. The question of the apostles to our Lord, which was grounded on some degree of misapprehension, involved three inquiries, 1. "When shall these things be?" 2. "What shall be the sign of thy coming? 3. "And of the end of the world?" And his reply, without noticing their misapprehension, gave distinct answers to each. The words, "This

"generation shall not pass till all these things "be fulfilled," especially answers the question, "When shall these things be?" that is, When shall these buildings of the temple be so entirely destroyed, that "not one stone shall be left upon "another?"[1] The answer, however, includes also the total subversion of the Jewish constitution, ecclesiastical and civil. It is also evident that, by "the coming of Christ," the apostles, at this time, understood his coming to judgment, which they supposed would be at "the end of the "world." Nothing could be further from their minds than the coming of the Messiah, in the sense of Mr. C. and of modern Jews: they believed that Jesus was "the Messiah, the Son of "the living God;" and consequently that, in this sense, the Messiah was come.—But, though Jesus did not see good, fully to rectify their mistakes on this head; leaving that to the times when the Holy Spirit should be poured out upon them; he evidently distinguished between his coming, in the power of his providence, to execute vengeance on Jerusalem and the Jews, and his final coming to judgment. The one was so connected with the destruction of the temple, that it may be allowed to be comprised in the words, "This generation shall not pass away, till all "these things be fulfilled." But of the other he says, "Of that day knoweth no man, no, not the "angels in heaven, but my Father only."[2] If, indeed, we are called on to argue with Jews from

[1] Matt. xxiv. 1—3. Mark xiii. 1—4. Luke xxi. 6, 7.
[2] Matt. xxiv. 34—37. Mark xiii. 30—37.

the New Testament, we must explain one part of the New Testament by another: and no impartial man, reading the account of the three evangelists carefully, can doubt that the coming of Christ, in most parts of these chapters, is not spoken of as *personal* and *visible*; but he came by the Roman armies, the instruments of his avenging justice. "As the lightning cometh out "of the east, and shineth even to the west; so "shall also the coming of the Son of man be: for "wheresoever the carcase is, there shall the eagles "be gathered together."[1] A Jew may consistently treat the whole of the prophecy as uninspired, and so as inconclusive: but he can with no consistency deny this to be *intended* by Jesus, in what he spake to the disciples. In the sense intended, he came about A. D. 71.; within considerably less than forty years after he delivered this prediction; and so before "that generation "was passed away." This, therefore, can prove nothing in the argument before us: for an entirely different subject was treated of.—Let it be noticed, that Mr. C., in order to render his arguments more plausible, selects two verses, one at the beginning, the other near the end of the chapter, omitting all that intervene; but the whole read together leaves a far different impression on the mind.

P. 29. l. 6. 'When the Messiah,' &c. Answer: Where does the writer learn that, when 'Messiah shall come, all the sons of Adam will

[1] Matt. xvi. 28. xxiv. 27, 28, 30, 37, 39. Mark xiii. 26. Luke xxi. 30—36.

'be of one language?' Nothing is predicted concerning this in the Old Testament. The passage most like it runs thus, "Then will I turn to "the people *a pure language*; that they may all "call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him "with one consent."[1] But not a word either precedes, or follows, concerning 'the coming of 'the Messiah:' and Christians expect that, during the days of the Messiah, (but long after his coming,) the prediction will have a most glorious accomplishment; and men "shall worship God, "*every one from his place*, even all the isles of "the gentiles."[2] Thus all, both Jews and gentiles, shall serve the God of Israel, not as of different religions, but "with one consent;" not in one place, but "every one from his place."[3]

Mr. C. seems here, however, to allow that "the "times of the gentiles" may mean the times, 'when all of them shall worship the true God.' (l. 8.) But this he afterwards disallows: 'All 'the gentiles will not worship the true God even 'to the last day.' (P. 89. l. 21.)

P. 89. l. 12. 'His coming was of no use,' &c. This assertion gives occasion to a very important inquiry; namely,

WHAT HAVE BEEN THE EFFECTS OF THE COMING OF JESUS CHRIST ON THE STATE OF THE WORLD, INCLUDING BOTH ISRAEL AND THE GENTILES?

Mr. C. repeatedly asks the question, 'Of what 'use was the coming of Christ?' He here says,

[1] Zeph. iii. 9. [2] Zeph. ii. 11. [3] Mal. i. 11.

'His coming was of no use, and therefore he 'could not be the Messiah.' And he subjoins, that his having taught multitudes 'the *true* 'worship' (which is supposing it to be 'the true 'worship') 'is a poor defence, and without 'foundation:' because Mohammed 'established 'a *new religion*, &c.:' as if the *true worship*, and a *new religion* were equivalent!—We, erring, sinful, and self-flattering mortals are wholly incompetent judges of the plans, counsels, and purposes of the infinite, eternal, and only wise God. To this day, some parts even of the structure of the human body remain so little understood, that the most skilful anatomists differ in opinion as to the functions performed by them: and some have been tempted to inquire, Of what use are they? Yet God hath created them. If then we are so incompetent to understand the plan of God, in respect of our own bodies; how presumptuous must it be, to reject any part of revealed truth, because we do not see the use of it! or rashly pronounce it useless! I would recommend to all who venture on this kind of language, to consider well the texts referred to below.[1] I might easily enlarge, but let this hint suffice. It is manifest that many things exist as the work of the Creator, of which we cannot perceive the usefulness: and events occur, which we might previously have supposed would have been prevented. The very existence of sin and misery, which God, infinite in wisdom, and power, and goodness, could have prevented, yet did not,

[1] Job. xxvi. 14. xxviii. 28. xl. 8. Ps. cxxxix. 6. Isa. xl. 13, 14.

is one grand instance, equally conclusive to persons of every creed and nation, that man's reasonings and imaginations are in no degree the measure, or standard, of the works and ways of God.[1]

The question, however, as it relates to the effects of the coming of Jesus Christ, admits of a satisfactory answer.

When Jesus was born at Bethlehem, the state of the Jews was extremely corrupt, according to the testimony of their own historian, Josephus; and was daily becoming more and more so. This might easily be proved in various ways: but I question, whether the Jews themselves, considering subsequent events, will be disposed to deny it.

The nations of the earth were generally sunk in gross idolatry, sensuality, and every species of enormous wickedness. The speculations of the few, who called themselves philosophers, terminated chiefly in a sort of practical Atheism: and even their moral discussions had little effect, either on their own conduct, or that of other men. It would, indeed, be no laborious task, to prove from their own writers, that the apostle has by no means overcharged the picture of the gentile world, in the first chapter of Romans.

Now there can be no doubt, that great numbers of the Jews were awakened from their formal and vicious lethargy, by the ministry of John the Baptist, our Lord's forerunner, and by the preaching of Jesus and his apostles. Soon after the

[1] Prov. iii. 5—7. Isaiah v. 21.

crucifixion of Jesus, several thousand Jews became his disciples, and, according to records, which no adversary ever ventured to accuse of falsehood, led most holy, harmless, and benevolent lives; and even "a great company (πολὺς ὄχλος) "of the priests became obedient to the faith." [1]

Persecution, however, soon drove great numbers of the converted Jews into distant lands; but, wherever they went, they made known the gospel to their countrymen, and in every place a remnant embraced it. These, in general, "walked in the "fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy "Ghost." Probably at the time of Saul's conversion there were ten times, perhaps a hundred times, more sober, righteous, and godly persons among the Jews, than there were at the beginning of John the Baptist's ministry; and immense numbers were added to them before the desolations of Jerusalem. These were only "a rem-"nant" compared with the whole nation: yet there can be little doubt that this remnant amounted to at least the 144,000, seen by John in vision, sealed from the twelve tribes of Israel. [2] And was the turning of so many tens of thousands of formal Israelites, with their families, to the Lord their God, and bringing them into the way of peace and salvation, 'of no use,' because the Jews as a nation rejected the Messiah?

Soon, however, the ministers of Jesus preached to the gentiles also, "that men should repent and "turn to God, and do works meet for repentance:" and in a short time vast multitudes "turned to

[1] Acts vi. 7. [2] Rev. vii. 4—8.

" God from idols, to serve the living and the true " God;" (p. 27. l. 33;) whose pious, holy, and useful lives rendered them as " lights" among their heathen neighbours. And, not to be prolix, the sacred leaven of the Christian doctrine, diffused its influence so rapidly among the nations, notwithstanding fierce and bloody persecution, that Christians abounded in all parts of the Roman empire: they soon were found in all their cities, and even in their courts and camps; millions were doubtless thus converted to 'the true 'worship' and a holy life; and at length, in about 300 years, Christianity became the established religion of all the nations which had formed the idolatrous Roman empire: and it so continues in most parts even to this day; besides its extension far beyond the utmost boundaries of that empire, to the east, and west, and north, and south.

There always, indeed, have been far more nominal Christians than real ones; as well as far more Jews and Israelites, than genuine children and imitators of Abraham and Israel: but who can deny that, after every reasonable reduction has been made, immense multitudes have become in all successive generations, the spiritual worshippers and servants of God, " they and their children with " them?" Will even a Jew deny, that everlasting salvation was the consequence of this conversion from idolatry and wickedness, to God and holiness? If he do, let him state the grounds on which he denies it. And is the everlasting salvation of millions 'of no use?' Is the introduction of so many hundreds of thousands, nay, millions,

of families, into the company of the true wo
shippers of God, which in many cases ensure
"the oracles of God" and the means of grace t
succeeding generations, 'of no use?'—Eve
among those who we fear are only nominal Chris
tians, Christianity has in every way produced mos
salutary and important effects. It has fixed th
standard and tone of morals far higher, than i
ever was in the Pagan nations of old, or than it i
among modern idolaters. It has terminate
gladiatorial shews, the allowed and sanctione
murder of infants, and various other murders
such as those of slaves, females, and old persons
with many more cruel and detestable practices an
customs: or it has driven them, like wild beasts
into deserts and secret lurking places. Christi
anity has mitigated the horrors even of war: it i
undermining slavery and mitigating its horrors
Christianity alone has built hospitals, and provide
asylums for the aged and destitute. We migh
easily enlarge, but a hint must here suffice.—
Mr. C. allows, that the Jews receive better treat
ment in this country than in others: but he is no
perhaps aware, that this is the effect of the su
perior knowledge of Christian principles an
duties, which prevails in this favoured land, mor
than in most others in the world. Were thes
still more fully understood and practised, the Jew
would meet with proportionably a more candid
equitable, and benevolent treatment, from th
inhabitants in general; not affected, or as deemin
their religious difference from us of subordinat
consequence; but as springing from our principle
and heart, and as the means of conciliating them

to our holy and loving religion. Ere long, I trust, the Jews will more effectually know *the use* of the coming of Jesus, and of his having been "preached to the gentiles," by means of such institutions as 'the London Society,' and by the blessing of God, on our endeavours to communicate our holy religion to Israel, and being instrumental to their expected conversion and restoration. In short all the true religion, which has been for successive ages in the whole world, or which exists at this day on earth, and we trust will soon diffuse its sacred influence among all nations, is the effect of the coming of Christ. If the Jews plead that their nation, or part of it, is at least an exception; without examining the validity of the plea, it must be allowed to be a solitary exception, and comprises a very small portion indeed of the whole human species.

But the meaning of Mr. C.'s question and objection is evident: he judges nothing of use, so long as his own nation is excluded from the desired dominion over other nations. In every other view, the advantages of Christianity to mankind, even as to morals and temporal good, have been incalculable: and millions, yea, probably hundreds of millions, have through it obtained "salvation with "eternal glory." Surely, then, Mr. C.'s objection is satisfactorily answered.

P. 29. l. 19. 'A man arose by the name of Mo-'hammed.' Leaving the discussion of several things advanced on this topic till afterwards, I will here take occasion to consider a subject of the highest importance in the controversy; namely,

THE TRIUMPHS OF JESUS AS COMPARED, AND CONTRASTED, WITH THOSE OF MOHAMMED.

I am not competent to decide whether 'Mo-'hammed has now many more followers than 'Christ.' (p. 29. l. 21.) Mohammed has comparatively but few followers in Europe, probably none in America. We know very little of the interior of Africa; but it is probable that that continent has far more Mohammedan than Christian inhabitants. China, Japan, and many of the northern parts of Asia, contain few either Christians or Mohammedans. But, however that may be, the followers of Mohammed are doubtless very numerous; and the success of that impostor has been exceedingly extensive and permanent. But three things should be considered, in comparing his success with that of Jesus. 1. The state of those regions in which the success of each was at first obtained: 2. The nature of the religion which each propagated: and 3. The means by which the triumphs of each were acquired.

1. The state of those regions in which the success of each was at the first obtained.

When our Lord entered on his ministry in Judea and Galilee, the inhabitants though hypocritical, or immoral, to a very great degree, were not *illiterate* or *uncivilized.* Most of them could read, and were acquainted with the Old Testament, and there were many learned scribes among them. They were also extremely attached to the forms of religion, and to "the traditions of the elders," on the knowledge of which they highly valued themselves.

The gentiles also, among whom the most signal and illustrious triumphs of Christianity were obtained, constituted in many respects the most civilized and learned part of the world, as known at that time: and the gospel began its course, when learning had but little declined from its highest celebrity, immediately after the Augustan age. The Greeks and Romans, who called the rest of the world *barbarians*, were the very people among whom the gospel obtained a vast proportion of its success, both at first and in subsequent ages. In the Roman colonies, and in the Grecian cities, in Egypt and the northern coast of Africa, in Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, and even Rome itself; the first Christian churches, out of Judea, were planted. In the heart of those renowned countries, not only addicted in a most haughty manner to their own customs and superstitions, and despising others, especially the Jews; but also comprising almost all the learning which was then known in the world; Christianity, preached by converted Jews, acquired such a firm establishment, as to undermine both pagan idolatry and pagan philosophy, and erect her throne on their ruins: and the effects continue to this day. This was accomplished, amidst the persecuting rage and cruelty of the Roman emperors and other princes; and amidst the scorn and vain reasoning of the philosophers, of every sect and name!

No doubt Christianity triumphed also, in uncivilized and illiterate regions; and at an early period it was established in Britain, then the abode of rude and almost naked savages. But a veil seems purposely to have been cast over the history

of Christianity in other parts of the world; and its triumphs in the seats of civilization, learning, philosophy, and authority, are almost exclusively recorded, at least in an authentic and satisfactory manner. Christianity scorned, so to speak, to shrink from the most acute and adequate investigation, or to take any advantage of men's ignorance and incapacity: it challenged the closest examination from all those who were most competent to detect the fallacy, if there were any, and to judge of its claims. It challenged, I say, this examination: it stood the test, and it triumphed over every opponent, through succeeding generations; and it has triumphed over all to this very day!

Mohammed, on the contrary, arose among the Arabs, who, (except in a kind of astronomy, not much better than astrology,) were extremely illiterate, as he himself also was. The time of his appearing coincided, not only with the deep corruption of Christianity, in various ways, and especially by the idolatrous worship of images of saints, and angels; but also with a term in the annals of history, marked by the decay, and almost extinction, of literature; and only to be exceeded in ignorance by the dreary ages which followed. The western empire had been subverted by the irruptions of the northern barbarians and others: and the eastern was so divided and enfeebled, that it was capable of making only a very slight resistance. Even the Persian empire was weakened almost to helplessness. The eastern church, also, was torn in pieces by fierce contests, as well as corrupted by pestilent heresies and superstitions.

'It is evident that Mohammed, by the teaching of some Jews, or, as others think, of a Nestorian monk, had acquired a confused knowledge of the Old Testament, and a superficial acquaintance with Christianity: and taking advantage of the divided and corrupt state of the church, which had widely deviated from the scriptures, he professed to be the apostle of God, to rectify and perfect both the religion of Jesus, and that of the Jews, and to establish the religion of 'Abraham 'the orthodox,' THE HALTER, so the Arabic word signifies. Abraham, says he, was not a Christian, not associating any with God in worship; not a Jew, as not observing the Jewish ceremonies: but he *halted* between both, and so was *orthodox*. His plausible pretences in this respect, among those who just knew enough to see that the worship of images and of created beings was idolatrous; but were too ignorant to discriminate on other matters with any accuracy; concurring with various other circumstances, gave him at length, and after many delays, considerable success among those of his own nation, and in the countries which had formed the eastern empire and the Greek church; where the most deplorable ignorance prevailed, not only among the laity, but even among the clergy and bishops. In after times indeed his successors and followers cultivated learning; and (which was easily effected,) added superiority in science to the victorious power of their arms. Thus their triumphs were extended more and more widely; in Asia, Africa, and many parts of Europe: and the Turks, or Othmans, succeeding to the Saracens, the establishment of Mohammedism

continues to this day. But neither at first nor a terwards, were its professors required to exhil their religion and its evidences amidst keen, sag cious, learned, and philosophical opponents, pc sessed of superior rank and authority, and able excite the arm of persecution, in aid of the exertions and reasonings, against the detest innovators; as the case had been, with those l whom Christianity was propagated. The triumpl of Mohammedism were in dark and illiterate age and in the dark and illiterate regions, of tl world: and, however it may have been in Afri and the east, the revival of learning, and the spir of acute investigation, which accompanied the r formation of Luther and his coadjutors, stayed tl progress of Mohammedism, in all countries i which the influence of that revolution in learnin and public opinion extended, and terminated i triumphs; nay, reduced its dominion within mo narrow limits.—This leads us to consider,

2. The nature of the religion which Jesus an Mohammed respectively propagated.

The religion of Mohammed, as far as doctrina points are concerned, resembled in many respec that of modern Socinians or Unitarians, as the very improperly and unfairly call themselve His great zeal was manifested against ASSOCIATORS or those who joined idols, or creatures, or Jesu Christ, or the Holy Spirit, with God in religiou worship; whom he condemns and anathematize and threatens with hell-fire, almost in ever chapter of the Koran, and often repeatedly in th same chapter. He argued almost exactly in th same manner against the idea of God's having

Son, as Mr. C. does. He attempted to divest Christianity, not only of its corruptions, but also of its mysteries; especially of "the great mystery "of godliness, God manifest in the flesh:" and how palatable this is to the pride of self-wise man we well know. "The offence of the cross," the doctrine of the atonement, and all ideas of *redemption*, are excluded from his system; along with that of *regeneration*, and a new creation unto holiness. Consequently the doctrines of original sin, man's depravity as a fallen creature, his universal exposedness to the wrath of God, and his need of gratuitous mercy and salvation, do not at all occur to affront the self-righteous and self-confident pride of the human heart.

In one particular indeed Mohammed wholly differed from modern Socinians; namely, that a state of future and eternal judgment is a prominent part of his system: but this, as he managed it, exceedingly forwarded his success among rude and ignorant barbarians and half Christians: for none but infidels, and 'associators,' and apostates from his religion, were exposed to it. All who believed in God and in his prophet Mohammed, and paid a kind of quit rent of prayers, alms, and pilgrimages, without regard to the holiness or unholiness of their general conduct, were secured against this tremendous doom. A sort of purgatory was declared for such believers as were not wholly prepared for paradise, or deserving of it: and all zealous believers, especially such as fought for the faith, were secure of immediate admission into his sensual heaven. 'The sword,' says Mohammed,

'is the key of heaven and hell; a drop of blood shed 'in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of 'more avail than two months of fasting and prayer. 'Whoever dies in battle, his sins are forgiven; 'and at the day of judgment, his wounds shall 'be resplendent as vermilion, and odoriferous as 'musk: and the loss of his limbs shall be supplied 'by the wings of angels.' I apprehend that numbers of nominal Christians would feel much less aversion to the doctrine of future and eternal punishments, if thus limited and explained, with reference to the external profession of Christianity, and attachment to it. Besides the dread of so dire a destruction for themselves, and for relatives and connexions, from which men shrink back; the idea that they are *deserving* of it for their rebellion against God tends exceedingly to set them against it.

The doctrines of human merit, in general, and of works of supererogation in particular, were inculcated by Mohammed. 'The two mountains, 'Sapha and Merva, are monuments of the sacred 'things of God. He, therefore, who shall go on 'pilgrimage to the house of God, and shall visit 'it, there shall be no guilt upon him, if he 'surround them: and he who performs any good 'work, of his own accord, truly God will be 'grateful.' Koran ch. 2.—تطوع 5 Conj. طاع *Suo libitu, et sponte, citra legis necessitatem aut dictamen boni quid fecit, deditve.* 'Of his own 'accord, beyond the necessity or dictating of the 'law, shall give or do any good thing.' *Golius.* —Especially every exertion, contribution or risk,

by which the faith of Mohammed could be propagated, was not only meritorious, but entitled a man to *indulgences* and extra rewards.

It is generally said, that Mohammed held *predestination*: and this is in some sense true; but his sentiments on that subject neither fully accorded with heathen *fatalism*, nor with Christian *predestination*. Differently from the heathens, he supposes, what we may call the *fatality* of events, to originate entirely from the decree of God: yet he by no means speaks of it as the result of infinite wisdom, justice, goodness, and truth, foreknowing and fore-appointing every thing in the best manner possible, for the display of his own glory, and the highest good of all obedient creatures, and of all the redeemed, and in general of his universal and eternal kingdom. He had just that kind and degree of persuasion, that all events are decreed and must come to pass, which operated on his soldiers in the very same manner as notions of *lucky* and *fortunate* do among our soldiers and sailors, to make them confident and fearless in every danger: but, in respect of human actions, he seems to make God the author alike of the good and of the evil.

Stated prayers, giving alms, chiefly a proportion of spoils taken in war, or of other gains, which Mohammed required as an oblation to God; fastings, for which very convenient and accommodating compensations are appointed, and pilgrimages, but especially 'fighting in the path 'of God,' form the substance of his practical religion. Moral precepts are very thinly scattered in the Koran, and very vaguely expressed;

and with much allowance to believers, even as much as the carnal heart can well desire. The "holy, just, good, and spiritual law" of God is as much left out, or thrown into the back ground, as the doctrines of redemption are. As much indulgence to the sensual passion, in respect of polygamy, and the concubinage of females taken in war, is granted, as human nature can wish for. It would be an outrage to common decency to quote the Koran on this subject; and still more its Mohammedan commentators, who generally make the text itself appear more filthy by their glosses than it really is. All limitations, except men could not bear the expense, were merely nominal: a limited number of wives was connected with concubinage, in most cases; while Mohammed's own example greatly exceeded, in licentiousness, the laws, however indulgent, which he prescribed to others. —He indeed, in some places, forbids the use of wine, but in others he seems to allow of it; or to consider the use of it only as unfavourable to his political designs; for delicious wines form one of the gratifications of his paradise. Not the least restraint was placed by his religion on pride, ambition, avarice, rapacity, or the malignant passions: nay the whole of his system tended greatly to nourish and encourage them.—Here then was every thing congenial to depraved nature; every thing gratifying to one or other of the corrupt passions. Even paganism, at least the system of pagan moralists and philosophers, required far more self-denial, and fixed a far higher standard of morals, than Mohammedism does.—To crown the whole, it proposed to the

hopes of its votaries a heaven of perpetual enjoyment of the most exquisite sensual delights, which the most voluptuous imagination could conceive, or the most carnal heart desire: 'They will feed 'on the most delicious fruits, be clothed in the 'most splendid silken garments, refreshed with 'rivers of water, wine, milk, and honey, enter-'tained with the most delightful music, and the 'ravishing girls of paradise, with black eyes, the 'enjoyment of whose company will be a principal 'felicity of the faithful.'

Mohammed is by many supposed to have maintained that women had no souls. This, however, does not appear to be well-grounded: but, as a new creation of most beautiful women, to continue for ever in youth and vigour, formed on purpose for the gratification of the faithful, was a most essential part of his heaven; it is plain that the women who were of his religion in this world could not well share the same felicity: yet he repeatedly speaks of believing women being admitted to paradise. Women, in his hateful system, were considered as almost exclusively the objects of men's sensual indulgence; and were in other respects of so little consequence, and he was so little concerned to excite them (who were in general the most abject slaves of the men,) to exertion in his cause; that he seems almost to have overlooked them in his views of a future world.

One further particular appears to belong to this part of the subject. The followers of Mohammed were fully entitled to all the spoil and captives taken from the vanquished, paying a small tax to

him out of it: while the inhabitants of the countries among whom they went had only the option of embracing the religion of the conquerors, and sharing their privileges, or of being slain or made slaves. This excessively facilitated their success, when once begun: and, though political wisdom afterwards, especially as to the Christians, modified this condition, yet the spirit of it prevailed to a very great degree.

From this view of the religion of Mohammed, it is evident to all who know human nature, and what suits the market, or coincides with the desires and imagined wants of men, that it was admirably adapted for the purpose. It had nothing in the general constitution of fallen human nature to oppose it, and much, very much to recommend it. The powers of darkness had no interest in exciting opposition to it, but the contrary. Local prejudices, customs, and superstitions, with personal interests, formed a temporary obstruction. So would learning and philosophy also, had any been found in those dark times and regions; and the authority of princes if any had been powerful enough to resist the torrent; but none were. Mohammed accordingly found difficulty, great difficulty, at first, in putting his machine in motion: but, that once effected, there needed no immediate divine interposition to give it efficacy; no, not even what Mr. C. calls '*good* '*fortune*: an immediate divine interposition was as requisite to arrest and stop its progress, as to stop that of a tremendous conflagration, or of an impetuous torrent.

Having obtained a full establishment, the same

causes added to its entire and inseparable union with the politics and government of Mohammed's successors: and other princes of that religion, have prolonged its prevalence, in ignorant and despotic countries; and probably will do so till the light of pure Christianity expose the whole to neglect and disgrace.

Few words may suffice for the contrast of the holy religion of Jesus, with the unholy system which we have delineated. The perfect law of "loving God with all the heart, and mind, and "soul, and strength," and of "loving our neigh-"bour as ourselves," is by it explained, and applied to every circumstance and relation of human life. Man is uniformly considered as a sinner deserving the wrath of God for his violations of this holy law; and by his proneness, arising from the carnal mind, to refuse subjection to it, he is represented as "a vessel of wrath fitted "for destruction;" inheriting fallen Adam's rebellious and apostate nature, and ready to imitate his disobedience. To man, in this ruined and wretched state, the most full, and suitable, and gracious proposals of mercy, reconciliation, and recovery to holiness are made: but in such a way as never for a moment suffers him to lose sight of the dreadful and hateful nature of sin, or of his just desert of final wrath and misery: and, in this proposal, through the righteousness, and redemption, and intercession of Immanuel, "God "manifested in the flesh;" the holy law is more especially honoured, both in its precept and in its awful sanction. Every doctrine of Christianity is diametrically opposite, nay, *designedly opposed,*

to man's pride of self-wisdom, self-righteousness, self-confidence, and self-will. He must, in order to be saved, "become a fool, that he may be made "wise;" and "receive the kingdom of God," not as a reasoning philosopher, but "as a little child." He must seek mercy, as a self-condemned criminal, "submitting to the righteousness of God," and renouncing his own righteousness. He must come even "to the throne of grace," not in his own name, but in the name of his faithful and merciful High Priest; and seek forgiveness and grace, not for his own sake, or for the sake of any thing which he has done or can do; but for the sake of the righteousness and atonement of his heavenly Advocate, and "through faith in his "name;" nay, even "the spiritual sacrifices of "praise and thanksgiving," are "acceptable only "through Jesus Christ."[1] This repentance, and faith, and grace, and "things accompanying sal-"vation," are all to be considered as "the gift of "God;" and the whole glory given to him. Man's restoration to holiness, his moral capacity of serving God acceptably in this world, and of enjoying his love in heaven, must be effected by "a new creation." "We are his workmanship, "created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Self-dependence and self-glorying, in every thing, are systematically and most carefully excluded. Every difference is ascribed to the grace of God. Even while we are called "to work out our own salva-"tion with fear and trembling," we are reminded that "it is God who worketh in us both to will

[1] Phil. i. 11. Col. iii. 17. Heb. xiii. 15, 16. 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5.

"and to do of his good pleasure." Every thing is suited to give offence to all, except "the poor "in spirit," and the humble in heart. Yet not the least allowance is given to any one of our corrupt inclinations. The mortification of those passions, which among men are in high estimation, is as absolutely required, as that of the most grovelling sensuality. Ambition and the love of human applause, and emulation of excelling others, and desire of power and prëeminence, are even more decidedly proscribed than drunkenness and licentiousness. "God resisteth the proud:" ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται. Christianity, again, makes no exceptions, in her impartial and holy requirements, in favour of the wealthy, the powerful, and the noble; no, not of kings and emperors: and, so far from making more allowance to the zealous professors of her holy truths than to others, she considers sin in them as far more heinous than in "those who know not God;" and denounces a doom on wicked professors of the gospel at the day of judgment, more intolerable than even that of Sodom. No zeal, or labours, or endowments, though a man should "speak with the tongues of "men and of angels," and should "give his body "to be burned," after having preached as long and as successfully as the apostle Paul himself, is allowed as a compensation for "working ini-"quity:" and, after all, if the preacher, or martyr, hath not "kept under his body, and brought it into subjection," (what a contrast to Mohammedan licentiousness!) he himself will be "a "cast-away."

At the same time, the heaven proposed by Chris-

tianity, is one of perfect purity and holy love: a heaven of perfect conformity to God, and constant delight in him, and in his worship and service. Such a heaven, as no unholy man could endure. "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." In order to be "made meet for this inheritance of "the saints in light," from which the most honourable and lawful of our earthly comforts and satisfactions are excluded, "the flesh must be crucified with its affections and lusts; the right hand which causes to offend, must be cut off; and even our most lawful attachments and inclinations must be habitually subjected to the holy will of God. As to this world, nothing is set before us but the prospect of self-denial and tribulation: except such supports and comforts as come from God alone, and consist principally in the hopes and earnests of heavenly glory and felicity. Food and raiment, with a contented mind, are the whole of that which is expressly promised. Instead of being allured like Mohammed's followers, by the hope of plunder and power, of wealth and sensual pleasure, we are called on to "deny ourselves, and "take up our cross," and follow our suffering Saviour, forsaking all and prepared to "lay down "our lives for his sake."

Were all men *consistent* Mohammedans, all would be sensual, selfish, ambitious, deceitful, malignant; "having a form of godliness, but "denying the power of it." Were all men *consistent* Christians, all would be piety, purity, humility, integrity, disinterested, liberal, self-denying love. The earth would be full of happiness, approximating to that of heaven, and preparing

for it: and, without any effort to induce them, men would every where "beat their swords into "plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, "and would learn war no more."

But our divine religion wants a more able panegyrist; not, as panegyrists in general, to ascribe to her undeserved honours, but to do her justice in any tolerable measure. These remarks, however, may suffice to shew, that, in such a world as this, a religion which declared war against all vices, and against all the proud virtues; all the ignorance and delusion, all the "science falsely so "called," all the irreligion, and all the existing religion, of mankind; which attempted not, like heathen moralists, to rule by balancing parties, and to prevail against grovelling vices by sanctioning ambition and love of glory; but proscribed all corrupt passions without exception: I say, that such a religion should become triumphant to the degree and extent, and in the durable manner, which it undeniably has; is an event unprecedented and astonishing, and which never could, in the prospect, have been imagined, except by those who considered the power of Almighty God as engaged to render it successful.—This may introduce the third part of our subject,

3. The means by which the triumphs of Christianity, and those of Mohammedism, were severally acquired.

The apostle might well say, "The weapons of "our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through "God to the pulling down of strong holds; cast-"ing down imaginations, and every high thing

"that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, "and bringing into captivity every thought to the "obedience of Christ." [1] Jesus himself appeared as a poor man, "not having where to lay his "head:" having been educated, not in the schools of learning, but in the cottage, nay in the carpenter's shop of Joseph; without wealthy or powerful connexions; and despised and opposed by all those who possessed learning, authority, rank, or influence, and those who were invested with the priestly character. He chose his immediate followers, and the ministers of his spiritual kingdom, the commanders in this holy warfare, from the fishing-boats of Galilee, or the receipt of custom. He paid no court to the great and noble, but "preached the gospel to the poor;" which was an additional reason of the opposition of the Jewish rulers to his claims, and continues to be so to this day. "He went about doing good," in the midst of all kind of opposition, contempt, reproach, and contradiction; and, when his numerous and stupendous miracles so affected the common people that they wanted to make him a King, and to enlist under his banners as a temporal leader; he decidedly resisted or evaded their attempts. Having spent some years in constantly preaching the word of life; exhibiting all the time a spotless example, performing innumerable miracles of mercy, 'patiently suffering all hardships and injuries, and employing his hours of retirement in fervent devotion; he was at last "led as a lamb to the

[1] 2. Cor. x. 4, 5.

" slaughter;" nailed to the cross as a deceiver and blasphemer; and expired amidst the cruel insults of rulers and people, of Jews and gentiles.

At this crisis his cause appeared hopeless, and his followers almost despaired. But behold! in less than two months after his crucifixion, his apostles, unarmed, unlettered, and obscure men, began boldly to preach the crucified Jesus as the Messiah, the Saviour, and Judge of the world, " the " Lord of glory" and the " Prince of life: charging the rulers of the Jews with having wickedly murdered him: attesting his resurrection from the dead, and ascension into heaven; and calling on all to believe in him, as they would escape the wrath of God, and obtain salvation; and appealing to the ancient prophets that " thus it was written " and thus it must be."

In this most perilous, and apparently hopeless service, which could not but give intolerable offence to all the rulers, and priests, and teachers, who had condemned Jesus; they had not the least protection, except from the power of God; and as the miracles which they wrought combined with their dignified and mild courage, to overawe their superiors, and impress favourably the multitude. They, however, stood their ground; and did not so much as flee from Jerusalem, or shrink from the most public testimony, after repeated imprisonments.—It would be tedious to enter into a further detail. They engaged in what must have appeared to the wise men of this world, a desperate attempt. They undertook (going forth " in the strength of " JEHOVAH, and proclaiming his righteousness,") to prevail against all the vice and the proud virtue,

the religion and the irreligion, the ignorance and the learning, and the philosophy of the whole world; and all the rooted habits, and customs, and supposed interests of every nation; with no other weapons than faithful, argumentative, persuasive preaching; holy and exemplary lives; fervent prayers; patient and constant sufferings, even unto death; and miracles of mercy and beneficence. If the reader would see a masterly delineation of their ministry, let him carefully consider the apostle's description of his own conduct. Giving no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed: but in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God; in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings; by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned: by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left: through honour and dishonour; through evil report and good report: as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, yet behold we live; as chastened, but not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things."[1]

To preach, as the Saviour and Judge of the world, and the Lord of all, the very person whom Pontius Pilate, by the earnest request of the Jewish rulers, priests, scribes, and people, had

[1] 2. Cor. vi. 3—10.

crucified between two robbers; to preach this in an enlightened age, and among the most enlightened nations; to preach this, under such circumstances, successfully and triumphantly: for such men as the apostles were, to accomplish this, to so great a degree as before their death to fix the foundations of Christianity on so firm a basis, and to prepare the way for such future successes, by far inferior instruments; that Christianity should effect the revolutions which it has effected, and continue and prevail, during so many centuries, amidst such persecutions, and so many internal corruptions and traitors, even to this day, with clear and opening prospects of still greater triumphs: this, I say, is the grand wonder of the world! But it was "not by might, nor by "power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of "hosts." Every thing combined to crush Christianity in its infancy and childhood, except as it was protected and prospered by Omnipotence.—Its triumphs during those ages, when, being exposed to persecution, no weapons but those above described were used, prepared the way for its subsequent successes. Other weapons, which were afterwards adopted, if they seemed to effect any thing, more than counterbalanced it, by disgracing the cause. To this day, all the valuable success of Christianity has been, and is effected, by the same weapons (miracles excepted,) which the apostles and primitive evangelists employed; and by those exclusively. And in the same way there seems an opening prospect of such increasing success as shall fulfil the prophecy, (Dan. ii.) of "the stone cut out of the mountain without

"hands, becoming a mountain, and filling
"whole earth."—"When the enemy came in l
"a flood," in the late inundation of infidel
and atheism, "the Spirit of God lifted up a st
"dard against him." The different Societies
promoting the cause of Christianity, are honou
as standard-bearers; but I must consider
British and Foreign Bible Society as the princi
standard-bearer of them all.

Now contrast the means by which Mohamm
obtained his triumphs.

The first step of Mohammed's emerging fr
obscurity was his marrying a rich widow, wh
affairs he had successfully conducted: and
appears that, when he aspired to the office a
honour of a prophet, she was his first disciple
and then some of her relations joined his cau
But he laboured by preaching, and other metho
of that kind, with very discouraging success,
several years; and indeed was exposed to mu
opposition and persecution from his idolatro
countrymen. He at length, however, by payi
court to the wealthy, who probably became se
sible that his views might be rendered subservie
to schemes of rapacity and ambition; of conque
plunder, and dominion; acquired several power
associates: and ere long he found himself plac
at the head of an army, well appointed, and eag
for conflict, victory, and rapine. The very natu
of his religion, to those who really credited
supplied powerful incentives to the carnal mi
to fight resolutely in promoting it: while t
abundant acquisitions made by the survivi
combatants most powerfully allured numbers

combine with them. Still, however, almost every chapter in the Koran shews the immense difficulties which he had to encounter from his more sceptical followers, because he wrought no miracles in proof of his mission. He is compelled to use evasions, to make vain excuses, and to menace those, who persisted in demanding such divine attestations, with miracles of vengeance. As new difficulties arose, he added new chapters to his book, with a most imposing confidence: and, when the new revelation contradicted any of those previously given, he did not scruple to say that God had changed his mind; in direct contradiction to what has been called his belief of predestination! He also pretended to work miracles: but he very wisely performed them, either entirely in private, or among a few select friends; so that the *report* of them was the only proof to men in general of his mision. Every delusion was practised; and he seems fully to have entered into the spirit of the maxim, *Si populus vult decipi, decipiatur*. 'After he had made himself master 'of Medina, he assumed in his new revelations, a 'fiercer and a more sanguinary tone.—He was 'now commanded to propagate his religion by the 'sword, to destroy the monuments of idolatry; 'and, without regarding the sanctity of days or 'months, to pursue the unbelieving nations of 'the earth. In the first months of his reign, he 'practised the lessons of this holy warfare: the 'martial apostle fought in person at nine battles 'and sieges; and fifty enterprizes of war were 'achieved in ten years, by himself and his lieu-

'tenants.'—'In the exercise of political govern-
'ment, Mohammed was compelled to abate of the
'stern rigour of fanaticism, and to comply, in
'some measure, with the prejudices and passions
'of his followers, and to employ even the vices of
'men, as the instruments of their salvation.—
'The use of *fraud and perfidy*, of cruelty and
'injustice, were often subservient to the propa-
'gation of the faith: and Mohammed commanded
'and approved the assassination of the Jews and
'idolaters, who had escaped in the field of battle.
'By the *repetition of such acts*, the character of
'Mohammed must have been gradually stained;
'and the influence of such pernicious habits,
'would be poorly compensated by the practice
'of the personal and social virtues, which are
'necessary to maintain the reputation of a prophet,
'among his sectaries and friends. Of his last
'years, ambition was the ruling passion; and a
'politician will suspect, that he secretly smiled
'(the victorious impostor,) at the enthusiasm of
'his youth, and the credulity of his followers. In
'the support of truth, *the arts of fraud and fiction*
'may be deemed less criminal; and he would
'have started at the foulness of the means, had
'he not been satisfied of the importance and jus-
'tice of the end.'—(*Gibbon.*) The reader will know how to appreciate such a confession as this, from the infidel author of 'The History of the 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire;' and how to allow for his base insinuations. Let the reader compare the apostles's words, "As we are "slanderously reported, and as some affirm that

"we say, Let us do evil, that good may come; "whose damnation is just;"[1] and learn the principles of our holy religion, so opposite both to the conduct of Mohammed, and the insinuations of Gibbon.

After the death of Mohammed, many most absurd miracles were said to have been wrought by him: but, if his successors had used no other "weapons of warfare," than either his Koran or his miracles, Mohammedism would soon have expired with its departed founder.

Such a sensual and worldly religion, however, enforced by the sword of numerous, victorious, and disciplined armies, full of enthusiastical devotees of their new faith, had little need of miracles to secure its success among the adjacent nations; considering their enfeebled and distracted state. Indeed, it must have been a most stupendous miracle, which could have arrested its progress: and it is most wonderful, that with such means, and such armies and commanders, it did not, as an overwhelming deluge, spread far more extensively its most destructive effects. But he who said to the ocean, "Hitherto shalt "thou go, and no further, and here shall thy proud "waves be stayed," limited and stopped its progress; exactly at the time and in the manner that had been predicted by the apostle many ages before.[2] Since that period, the cause has at least been stationary for some ages: and there are at present (directly contrary to the prospects which Christianity presents, at a far later period of its

[1] Rom. iii. 5—8. [2] Rev. ix.

existence,) many symptoms of its declining influence, and indications of its approaching ruin.

I shall rejoice, if this compendious statement may excite younger, and more learned men, who have access to books, which in my retired situation I have not, to investigate this subject more fully. For, though Christians have hitherto seemed little aware of it, Mohammedism, with the *superficial* (that is, with *a vast majority of mankind,*) is the most specious and dangerous rival of Christianity on earth; and requires far greater study and labour to expose it, than have yet been employed. The most of what has been done has been done by papists: but

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis,
Tempus eget.

Compare then the state of the nations in which Christianity triumphed, and in which Mohammedism triumphed, as to learning, policy, and religion; the opposite nature of the holy religion of Jesus, and of the unholy imposture of Mohammed; and the means by which each succeeded: and, I trust, it must be allowed, that the success of Mohammedism does not afford so much as the shadow of an argument against the divine mission of the holy Jesus.

I believe, I might now leave the whole of what Mr. C. says on this subject, (p. 29. l. 30.) to its doom, as requiring no further answer. The doctrine of the Trinity, (p. 29. l. 31.) and that of antitrinitarians, cannot be disposed of, or the controversy settled, by such remarks. The Jew

laughing at Christians and Turks; (p. 30. l. 6.) the lawsuit; (l. 7.) the castle, &c; (l. 17.) are surely so stated as to be displeasing even to considerate Jews. It is indeed grievous, that, in subjects of infinite importance, men can so egregiously trifle; and divert themselves and one another, in the great concerns of eternal salvation or damnation. In this lawsuit there is no *judge*; the *parties*, *witnesses*, and *deciders*, are all the same three companies; viz. the Jew, the Turk, and the Christian; and the Jew of course decides in his own behalf. But how will God decide at last? "Do ye think that I will accuse you to the "Father: there is one that accuseth you, even "Moses in whom ye trust: for had ye believed "Moses ye would have believed me; for he "wrote of me."[1] I trust this will be proved in the course of the present work.

The Christian indeed, heartily believes that the law of Moses is "the law of God:" but he distinguishes between what was introductory to the Messiah's coming, and what is of permanent, nay, of eternal obligation: but the Mohammedan equally allows the truth of Christianity, as of the Mosaic law: he distorts both of them, and endeavours to maintain his system on the ruins of both. Mohammed never attempts to adduce any thing from the Old Testament, without adding, altering, leaving out part, and polluting the rest. Perhaps the power of falsehood in marring the beauty, purity, and simplicity of scriptural narrative, does not appear more striking in Hesiod's dreams about

[1] John v. 45, 46.

Pandora's box, than in Mohammed's history o Joseph.

In fact, of all the books which I ever attempte to read, the Koran contains the fewest ideas, an the most wearying sameness. I suppose they who fully understanding Arabic, read it as, in som respects, a living language, find the periods an cadences sonorous and pompous. But it is th *dullest* book I ever opened: and I turn from i with a sort of anticipated satisfaction, not only t the sacred scriptures, or to the writings of Chris tians, or to heathen moralists; but even to th entertaining and ingenious fictions and trifles o the Latin and Greek poets.

P. 30. l. 30. 'Good fortune attended both. What is the meaning of '*good fortune*,' in th vocabulary of a Jew or a Christian? I read nothing of it, either in the original scriptures, or in ou translation of them. In our Prayer Book translatio of the Psalms, 'good luck' thrice occurs; and i would be an improvement if it were changed fo some other term: but, as it is 'good luck in the nam of the Lord,' it does not lead us to erroneous senti-ments.—The heathen considered Fortune as a sor of independent goddess, in some respects superio to their other gods; and they built temples an altars, and offered sacrifices, to her: and the clause 'good fortune attended them both,' savours of th same heathenism. It has been seen how God made Christianity successful: but, as to Moham-med's success, we may write as one did under Pope Adrian's inscription, '*Hic Deus nihil fecit.*' Indeed the same reprehension is far more justly due to all Mr. C.'s language in this passage.

Moses, Jesus, Mohammed: Jew, Christian, Turk, begin, continue, and end the whole; as if altogether independent of God, who is not at all mentioned, except as the law of Moses is called 'the law of God.'—But this is not the worst. What shall we say to such language as this? 'If 'Moses should one day come to visit his castle, he 'would be surprised to find two castles built on the 'top of his: and in a great rage, *he would command* '*one of his tempests*, saying, Go ye and pluck 'them both off, and cast them away, and let me 'see no more of them.' How different the language of prophecy! "Thus saith the Lord God; "I will even rend it with a stormy wind in my "fury, and there shall be an overflowing shower "in mine anger, and great hailstones in my fury "to consume it. So will I break down the wall ye "have builded with untempered mortar," &c.[1] Are the *tempests* at the command of Moses? Are they *his tempests*? Surely this language is as contrary to the Old Testament as to the New. Let us at least, in pleading our several causes, not forget, that "the Lord reigneth."—Mr. C. makes the word Turk to mean the same as Mohammedan: (p. 29. l. 22. 23.) but *Turk* is the name of a *nation*, not of a *religious body*. Probably, the Turks in general are Mohammedans: but the Mohammedans in Persia, the East Indies, and the interior of Africa, are not Turks.

P. 31. l. 6. 'The castle of Moses will stand 'for ever.'—What says Jeremiah on this subject?

[1] Ez. xiii. 10—16. Job xxxviii. 22—25. Ps. cvii. 25. Jer. x. 13. Jon. i. 4.

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I "will make a new covenant with the house of "Israel, and with the house of Judah. *Not* "*according to the covenant which I made with* "*their fathers*, when I took them by the hand to "bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my "covenant they brake, although I was a husband "unto them, saith the Lord. And this shall be "the covenant that I will make with the house of "Israel, after those days, saith the Lord, I will "put my law in their hearts, and write it in their "inward parts; and I will be their God, and they "shall be my people. And they shall teach no "more every man his neighbour, and every man "his brother saying, Know the Lord: for they "shall all know me, from the least of them unto "the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will "forgive their iniquity, and I will remember "their sin no more." Was not the apostle "warranted by this prediction to say, "In that "he saith, *a new covenant*, he hath made the "first *old:* now that which decayeth, and waxeth "old, is ready to vanish away?"[1] Even the letter and form of the law of Moses, as it relates to ritual observances, has not only in its most important requirements been rendered impracticable, ever since the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, that is for above seventeen hundred years; but it has also been disregarded in many things practicable, by the Jews in their dispersions.

P. 31. l. 8. 'It was ordained that there should

[1] Jer. xxxi. 31—34. Heb. viii. 8—13.

'be four empires,' &c. The Messiah is predicted by Daniel as coming under the fourth kingdom, made known by Nebuchadnezzar's dream:[1] but his coming was predicted under the emblem of "a stone cut out without hands;" evidently intimating the feeble beginnings of his kingdom; being of the same import with the parables of the grain of mustard-seed, and of the leaven, by which Jesus Christ predicted the nature and progress of his gospel.[2] Its original was small, and its success gradual, and at first unobserved by the rulers of the world: it proceeded without any human help, or power, and amidst great opposition from man. The coming of the Messiah must indeed be under the fourth kingdom; and so was the coming of Jesus: but it is *his final success*, when "the stone cut out without hands became "a great mountain, and filled the whole earth," which is predicted as taking place when the fourth kingdom was divided into ten kingdoms. There is no intimation that the Messiah should not come till that time: on the contrary the same prophet predicted that he should come before the desolations of Jerusalem.[3] "Of the *increase* of his "government and peace there shall be no end," says Isaiah.[4] Jesus came when the fourth kingdom had attained to its height of power and dominion: and by the influence of his gospel, and by those "weapons of warfare" which have been described, he undermined and subverted the pagan idolatrous

[1] Dan. ii. 34, 35. 44, 45.
[2] Matt. xiii. 31—33.
[3] Dan. ix. 24—27.
[4] Is. ix. 7.

power of Rome; and its temporal dominion a length was enfeebled, till ten kingdoms wer formed out of that unwieldy fabric; the legs an thighs of iron terminated in the ten toes of th image: and in this form, "the stone cut ou "without hands shall smite the image," and full dissipate it "as chaff," and "shall become a grea "mountain, and fill the whole earth." This re mains to be fulfilled; but it is connected with th last victories, and largest increase of the kingdom of the Messiah, and not with his first coming, an his feeble beginnings. Indeed nothing in th whole prophecy is at all spoken concerning th coming of the Messiah; but merely about th fifth kingdom, and its final prevalence, and it "filling the whole earth."

P. 31. l. 18. 'Messiah to come twice?' Chris tians do not suppose that the Messiah will com twice, in that sense in which Mr. C. seems to pro pose the question: or a second time, until h shall come in glory to judge the world: except i that sense, in which it has been shewn, that h came in the early times of the gospel, to set up hi kingdom, to rescue his persecuted church, and t take vengeance on his crucifiers, by destroyin Jerusalem and the temple, and inflicting the mos tremendous judgments on the Jews; even by th power of his providence, and by the sacred influ ence of his holy Spirit. He will also come agai ere long, to dissipate all remains of the Roman antichristian, persecuting empire, and "to fill th "earth with his glory." He came once "as "child born, as a son given;" "as a root out of

"dry ground, without form or comeliness, or any "beauty that men should desire him:" [1] but he shall come again gloriously, as Lord of all, as "King of kings and Lord of lords," to take to himself the kingdom over all the earth.

Some Christians indeed expect his *personal* appearance and reign on earth: but this seems, to me at least, not capable of proof, either from the Old Testament or the New: and the first verses of the sixty-third chapter of Isaiah, clearly predict his coming as a conqueror, to destroy his enemies, and rescue his people; indeed as clearly as any part of the New Testament.

Thus Daniel also says, "I saw in the night visions, "and behold one like the Son of man came with "the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient "of days; and there was given to him dominion, "and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, na- "tions, and languages should serve him: his "dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall "not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall "not be destroyed." [2] "The Son of man" is here spoken of, not as coming from heaven to earth, to receive this kingdom; much less as born on earth, and coming as "a child born, and a son given;" but as ascending from the earth into the presence of "the Ancient of days," and receiving from him this kingdom. This then, however interpreted, must be distinct from his first coming, as "a child "born." 'Though the immediate ruler of this 'kingdom be called "the Son of man:" yet it is 'obvious that there is something amazing in the

[1] Is. ix. 6, 7. liii. 1, 2. [2] Dan. vii. 13, 14

'prophetic description of the high honour and 'glory that is given to him. There is at least some 'difficulty in conceiving how such everlasting 'glory and dominion should belong to any one, who 'should be no more than man, or a mere creature: 'and particularly in conceiving how such magni-'ficent things should be ascribed to one, who was 'no more than "the Son of man," by the prophets 'who inculcated so strongly and justly, that all 'mere creatures, are before God, as nothing, and 'less than nothing.' (*Maclaurin.*)

If Christians have formed expectations which the scripture does not warrant, that may be shewn: but the coming of Christ has been so *unanswerably* proved to be predicted as an event preceding the destruction of the temple by the Romans, and the dispersion of the Jews, that no misapprehension of that kind can affect the main question.

Was the "little stone a great mountain" filling, or immediately to "fill the whole earth," at the very time when it was "cut out of the mountain "without hands?" Isaiah prophecies that of "the "*increase* of his government and peace there shall "be no end:" but this imagination would preclude "*increase*. The prophet says, "In the days of "those kings," and not after they were destroyed, but when they were in full dominion; and his language implies that the kingdom, which the God of heaven would set up, would have a sharp conflict with opposing powers, before its final victory and triumph.[1] It should be carefully observed, that the coming of the Messiah is not mentioned

[1] Dan. ii. 44.

in this whole prophecy, nor even the Messiah himself. Mr. C. indeed says, 'It pleased God to shew 'to Nebuchadnezzar in a dream what should come 'to pass *until the coming of the Messiah*, and that 'there should be four empires *until that time*. (P. 32. l. 4.) But this is so far from being accurate, that neither Nebuchadnezzar, nor any other man, would ever have known that a Messiah should come at all; if no clearer predictions of his coming had been given, than this prophecy contains.—With the other prophecies before us, we can understand that the fifth kingdom predicted is that of the Messiah: but, neither from Nebuchadnezzar's dream itself, nor from Daniel's interpretation of it, could any man have known this. If Christians have indeed adduced it as the grand proof that the Messiah should come twice, they seem to have acted very injudiciously; for, in fact, the coming of the Messiah at all cannot be proved from it, as an insulated prophecy; much less can any conclusive argument be deduced respecting the time of his coming. We only learn that the fifth kingdom, the kingdom which "the God of "heaven should set up," would grow from "a "stone, cut out without hands, and become a "mountain, and fill the whole earth;" and that this vast enlargement of the stone, into a mountain filling the whole earth, would take place after the fourth kingdom had been divided, and would be introduced by the entire destruction and dispersion of that kingdom.[1] The dream deposes nothing beyond this: all else must be added,

[1] Dan. ii. 33—35, 44, 45. See Is. ii. 2—4.

either from other scriptures, or from human traditions and imaginations.

P. 33. l. 14. 'How could it be that the Messiah,' &c. Answer: By his rising from the dead, and ascending into heaven, and being invested, as the Son of man, with all authority and "power in "heaven and earth."

P. 38. l. 19. 'He could not come before the end of 'the fourth empire.' How then could he subvert it?

P. 34. l. 1. 'The person who hath eyes,' &c. Important subjects must be discussed by *argument*; and not by *assuming* wisdom and truth to be on our side. The reader may obtain some information on this point from the texts referred to below.[1]

P. 34. l. 19. 'He will smite them only once.' Where does Daniel say this? He shall smite them, and their destruction will be effected: but nothing is spoken whether it will be by one blow or by many, at once or in a course of ages.

P. 34. l. 30. 'No Messiah for the Gentiles.' The first text adduced as a proof of this position is an exhortation, or command, to "the daughter "of Zion to rejoice," &c. But *exhortations* are not always complied with; *commands* are not always obeyed; nor were they by "the daughter "of Zion" either in this, or in numerous other instances. "The daughter of Zion" had cause to rejoice, and ought to have rejoiced, when her King came unto her: and some, yea many, tens of thousands of the Jews did rejoice;[2] but, as the

[1] Prov. iii. 5, 6. xxvi. 12. Is. vi. 9, 10. xxix. 10—13. xlii. 19, 20. Rom. xi. 7—10. 2 Cor. iii. 13—18.

[2] Zech. ix. 9, 10. Matt. xxi. 4—11. Mark xi. 9—11. Luke xix. 36—38. John xii. 12—19.

nation in general, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, in particular, rejected and crucified their King, and persecuted with unrelenting enmity his loyal subjects, they were adjudged traitors; and no wonder that the traitors did not rejoice at the coming of their King. (P. 35. l. 5.) No doubt the Messiah is especially "the King of Zion;" and Jesus came to Zion.—*Unto thee, but not to another.* (P. 34. l. 33.) In the next verse after the text quoted, it is said, "He shall *speak peace unto* "*the heathen;* and his dominion shall be from "sea even to sea, and from the river even to the "ends of the earth."[1] The other texts adduced, (P. 35. l. 14.) either relate to subjects widely different from the coming of the Messiah, and the question under consideration; or they will come in our way, when we consider what the prophets foretold concerning the reception of the promised Messiah by his countrymen, and the event of their conduct in this particular.

'"*Thy King cometh,*" *but not the King of the* 'Gentiles.' '"*Unto thee,*" *but not to another.*' Some may think the whole of this is a quotation from the prophet; but the latter part of each clause is either interpolation, or unfounded exposition.

P. 35. l. 23. 'There is no Messiah,' &c. Certainly if Jesus be not the Messiah the gentiles have *none;* nor the Jews either.—Wherever Mr. C. finds a proof, that the Messiah would be man, he imagines that he has found a proof that he is no more than man: (P. 17.) and, wherever he finds that the Messiah should come to Israel,

[1] Zech. ix. 10. Eph. ii. 15—17.

he imagines he has found a proof that he will not come to any except Israel. But was it predicted that the Messiah would deliver Israel, even if they obstinately rejected him? and all Israelites, however wicked? and none but Israelites?—Moses and the prophets teach a far different doctrine.

The prophecy from Joel, some detached parts of which are quoted, does not mention the Messiah at all, or the time of his coming. It is a remarkable prediction of Israel's restoration, and the terrible destruction of those who obstinately oppose it; and of other coincident events, which cannot be clearly understood till the fulfilment. But, considered as the sequel of the preceding chapter, the whole sets before us, 1st, The pouring out of the Holy Spirit on the apostles and Jews, after our Lord's ascension; 2dly, The terrible destruction of the unbelieving Jews, at the taking and burning of their city; with their subsequent sufferings and oppressions; and 3dly, Their restoration and the destruction of their enemies.

P. 36. l. 6. 'No Messiah for the Gentiles,—'by the proof of their gospel.' Here a similar interpolation occurs, 'But not of the gentiles;' as if these were the words of Matthew![1]

THAT THE MESSIAH IS PREDICTED AS A MESSIAH FOR THE GENTILES, AS WELL AS FOR ISRAEL.

To prove from the New Testament, that there is no Messiah for the gentiles, is such an arduous attempt, that he who succeeds in it needs not despair of accomplishing any thing which he can

[1] Matt. ii. 6.

possibly undertake. But far different proof will be requisite than that which is here given. A few hints on the texts quoted, and on the use made of them, will follow the more direct argument, that the Messiah is predicted in the Old Testament, and recorded in the gospel, as 'the 'Messiah of the Gentiles' as well as of the Jews. All the prophecies, however, which speak expressly of the Messiah, with one voice announce him to be the "Messiah of the Gentiles," as well as of Israel: but all these, as well as the numerous passages which the New Testament contains on this subject, are by Mr. C. passed over in entire silence, as if they did not exist. I, however, must adduce some of them as a specimen.—The first predictions of scripture which can possibly relate to this subject, having been given at the very time when the distinction between Abraham and his seed, and the "families of the gentiles," began to be revealed, is decisive on this question. To Abraham: "In thee shall all the families of the "earth be blessed."[1] "In thy seed shall all the "nations of the earth be blessed."[2] To Isaac: "In thy Seed shall all the nations of the earth be "blessed."[3] To Jacob: "In thee, and in thy "Seed, shall all the families of the earth be "blessed."[4] Now was the Messiah predicted in these promises to the patriarchs, or was he not? If he was, the question is at once completely answered. All nations were to be "blessed in "him," even "all the families of the gentiles."

[1] Gen. x. 5, 20, 31, 32. xii. 3.
[2] Gen. xxii. 18.
[3] Gen. xxvi. 4.
[4] Gen. xxviii. 14.

If not, how, and when, and in what "seed of "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," have "all nations "been blessed?" or shall they hereafter be blessed? This question requires and demands a clear and full answer; or the cause is abandoned, and no such answer can possibly be given.

I shall reserve to another place, the words of God by Moses, "Rejoice ye nations with his "people;"[1] because Mr. C. has made an observation on them, which will require notice. (p. 116.) But probably most readers will allow that the apostle has made the proper application of them: and how could any of the nations, or gentiles, continuing such, "rejoice with Israel," if there were no Messiah for them?

The language of the second Psalm demands our particular attention: for several things contained in it can be verified in no other but the Messiah. "Yet have I set," (or *anointed, Marg. Heb.*) "my King upon my holy hill of Zion.— "I will declare the decree: The Lord hath said "unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I "begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee "the heathen for thine inheritance, and the "uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, and "shall dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be "wise now therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, "ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with "fear, and rejoice with reverence. Kiss the Son, "lest he be angry, and so ye perish from the "way, when his wrath is kindled but a little.

[1] Deut. xxxii. 43. Rom. xv. 10.

"Blessed are all they that put their trust in "him."[1] How is this, that, in the midst of a prophecy of the Messiah, as "breaking the nations "with a rod of iron, and dashing them in pieces "as a potter's vessel;" the kings and judges of the earth are called on to kiss "the Son lest he be "angry?" Does not this imply submitting to him, and vowing allegiance to him, yea, honouring him as their Lord and God?[2] How is it that they are not only thus called on to avoid or deprecate his wrath, and escape destruction, but that a general blessing is pronounced on all who "put "their trust in him?" 'How could this be, if there 'were no Messiah for the gentiles?' Or what blessing could be to those who trusted in him, if he were no more than man, and "the Son of "man," as other men are?[3] If any assert that this Psalm is not a prophecy of the Messiah; let him shew, by a fair and particular explanation of the terms employed in it, and by adducing facts coincident with it; how it was or could be fulfilled in David, or in any other, except David's Son and David's Lord; "the only-"begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

In the twenty-second Psalm, which will hereafter be shewn to be a most undeniable prophecy of "the sufferings of Christ, and of the glory "that followed,"[4] it is said, "All the ends "of the earth shall remember themselves, "and be turned unto the Lord, and all the "kindreds of the nations shall worship before

[1] Ps. ii. 6—12. [2] 1 Sam. x. 1. 1 Kings xix. 18. Hos. xiii. 2.
[3] Ps. cxlvi. 3—6. Jer. xvii. 5—8. [4] Luke xxiv. 26, 27. 44—47. 1 Pet. i. 10—12.

"him." "A seed shall serve him; they shall be "counted to the Lord for a generation. They "shall come and declare his righteousness to a "people that shall be born, that he hath done "this."[1] It is here predicted, that all nations on earth shall, through the Messiah, become the worshippers of JEHOVAH; and in him, "a generation," and "a chosen generation," like that of Israel; "a nation that shall be born," according to the "prophecies of Isaiah; He "shall be called the "everlasting Father," or, "the Father of the age "to come:" and "he shall see his seed and shall "prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord "shall prosper in his hand."[2]

In another Psalm it is said, "His name shall "endure for ever: his name shall be continued "as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed "in him; all nations shall call him blessed:"[3] or, "shall bless themselves in him;" the very words are used in the original, which occur in the promise made to Abraham,[4] except as the preterite with the *vau* conversive is used in one place, and the future in the other. Now, is this Psalm a prophecy of the Messiah, or is it not? If it be, then "all nations shall bless themselves in him," and "call him blessed;" but how can this be, if there be 'no Messiah for the gentiles?' If it is not; let it be shewn how the several particulars predicted in it, were, or could be, accomplished in the short lived glory of Solomon's reign.—Surely "a "greater than Solomon is here!"

[1] Ps. xxii. 27—31.
[2] Is. ix. 6. liii. 10.
[3] Ps. lxxii. 17.
[4] Gen. xxii. 18.

"The Lord hath made known his salvation: "his righteousness hath he openly shewed in the "sight of the heathen. He hath remembered his "mercy and truth to the house of Israel; and all "the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of "our God." Make a joyful noise unto God all the "earth, &c."[1]—But, how shall "all the ends of "the earth see and rejoice in the salvation of "God," if there be 'no Messiah for the Gentiles?'

But for the sake of brevity, I shall pass over many other evident predictions of the same events. It will not be denied that Isaiah prophesied of the Messiah, as "the rod from the stem of "Jesse," in his eleventh chapter: but he there says, "The earth shall be full of the knowledge "of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. And "in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which "shall stand for an ensign to the people, to it "shall the gentiles seek, and his rest shall be "glorious." This precedes the prediction of 'the 'restoration of Israel,' and the song of praise prepared by the Holy Spirit, for the use of converted Israel on that grand occasion.[2] The apostle quotes part of the prophecy from the Septuagint: "He that shall arise to reign over the gentiles, in "him shall the gentiles trust."[3] This gives the real import, though not an exact translation. Let it, however, be observed, that he who sprang from Jesse's root would "stand for an ensign to the "peoples;"[4] and "to him would the gentiles "seek; and his rest would be glorious." For,

[1] Ps. xcviii. 2—4. See also Ps. lxxxvi. 9. cxvii.
[2] Is. xi. 9—16. xii. [3] Rom. xv. 12.
[4] John iii. 14, 15. xii. 32.

Shiloh being come, "to him would the gathering "of the peoples be:" "All nations would bless "themselves in him," and find a "more glorious "rest" than Israel did in Canaan.[1] Now the gentiles could not flock to the Messiah, as to a standard:[2] they could not seek to him, and find a "glorious rest in him; if there were 'no 'Messiah for the gentiles.'[3]

"In this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make "to all peoples" *(plural,)* "a feast of fat things, "a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of "marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And "he will destroy in this mountain the face of the "covering cast over all peoples, and the veil "which is spread over all nations, &c."[4] How, or when, has this prophecy been fulfilled, or can it be fulfilled, except the blessings of Messiah's reign be imparted to all nations? And how is it possible, if there be 'no Messiah for the gentiles?'

"Behold my Servant, whom I uphold, my Elect "in whom my soul delighteth, I have put my "Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judg- "ment to the gentiles.—He shall not fail or be "discouraged, till he have set judgment in the "earth; and the isles shall wait for his law."[5]— "In his name shall the gentiles trust." (*Sept.*) Thus the evangelist quotes it. His *law*, evidently means his *instruction, doctrine, command,* as in another prophecy of Isaiah.[6] "For his law shall "the gentiles look with expectation:" יִיחֲלוּ.[7]— "The Lord hath called thee in righteousness, and

[1] Matt. xi. 28—30. Heb. iv. 8, 9. [2] Is. v. 26. xiii. 2. xviii. 3. xxx. 17. *Heb.* [3] See also Is. xix. 23—25. [4] Is. xxv. 5—8. [5] Is. xlii. 1—4. [6] Is. ii. 2—4. [7] Is. xlii. 5. li. 5. *Heb.*

" will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and " will give thee for a covenant of the people, for " a light to the gentiles ; to open the blind eyes, " to bring out the prisoners from the prison ; and " them that sit in darkness out of the prison- " house."—" Sing unto the Lord a new song ; " and his praise from the end of the earth, ye that " go down to the sea, and all that is therein ; the " isles and all the inhabitants thereof." [1]—What ! ' Is there no Messiah for the gentiles ?' When " the gentiles shall wait for his law ;" and he " shall be the light of the gentiles." " When all " the inhabitants of the isles shall sing," on account of him, " a new song unto the Lord." [2] Who can help recollecting, in this connexion, the words of old Simeon ? " Mine eyes have seen thy " salvation ; which thou hast prepared before the " face of all people ; a light to lighten the gentiles, " and to be the glory of thy people Israel." [3]

" And now, saith the Lord, who formed me " from the womb, to be his servant, to bring Jacob " again to him ; though Israel be not gathered, " yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, " and my God shall be my strength. And he " said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be " my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and " to restore the preserved of Israel : I will also " give thee for a light of the gentiles, that thou " mayest be my salvation to the ends of the " earth." [4] Some parts of this prediction will come again under consideration : but the question

[1] Is. xlii. 6, 7, 10—12. Zech. ix. 11. Acts xxvi. 18—20.
[2] Rev. v. 9, 10. xiv. 3.
[3] Luke ii. 25—32 Acts xiii. 47. xxviii. 28. [4] Is. xlix. 5—12.

here recurs, Is the whole a prophecy of the Messiah, or is it not? If not, whom, and what events, does it foretel? When has it been, or when will it be, fulfilled? It is impossible to give any other interpretation of it, considered clause by clause, than that which refers it to the Messiah; the treatment, which he met with from the Jews, and the calling of the gentiles: but how can these things be, if there be 'no Messiah for the gentiles?' It foretels also, that Israel, as a nation would not be gathered by the Messiah; but only a remnant of them, called "the preserved of "Israel." For "the Redeemer of Israel, and his "holy One," addressed "him whom man des-"piseth, whom the nation abhorreth, a servant of "rulers;" yet it is predicted that "kings shall "see and arise, princes also shall worship, because "of the Lord, who is faithful;" with much more to the same effect.[1] "Behold," says the Lord, "I have given him for a witness to the people, a "leader and a commander to the people. Behold, "thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not, and "nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee."[2] Who is this, to whom "nations that knew him "not shall run," but "Shiloh, to whom the ga-"thering of the people shall be?" Is not then the Messiah predicted as the Messiah of the gentiles?[3]

In fact, I feel myself in this part of my subject pressed with a considerable difficulty; having only the choice of two things, each apart unde-

[1] Is. xlix. 22, 23. [2] Is. lv. 4, 5. See also Is. lx. lxv. 1, 2, compared with Rom. x. 19—21.

[3] Is. lxv. 14, 15, compared with Acts xi. 26. lxvi. 18—22.

sirable: namely, either to pass over, and as it were *suppress*, a great part of the evidence; or to weary the reader with tedious argument, and superfluous evidence. I, therefore, only just touch upon points which might with great advantage be more fully pressed, were proofs scanty; and pass over, or merely refer to, portions of scripture, alone sufficient to decide the argument, beyond all reasonable controversy. Some of these will come in our way, on other topics; and I must hasten to conclude this part, by a few quotations from the other prophets.

"O Lord," says Jeremiah, "my strength and "my fortress, the gentiles shall come unto thee "from the ends of the earth, and shall say, Surely "our fathers inherited lies, vanity, and things "wherein there is no profit."[1] Certainly "the "gentiles to the ends of the earth" are here represented, as, of *their own accord*, "coming unto" the true God, as renouncing idols, and as avowing themselves his worshippers. But shall this take place under the Messiah's reign, or at some other time?

Do the apostles give the true meaning of the predictions of Hosea, when they apply them to the conversion of the gentiles? "I will call them "my people, which were not my people, and her "beloved, which was not beloved: and it shall "come to pass, that in the place where it was "said unto them, Ye are not my people, there "shall they be called the children of the living

[1] Jer. xvi. 19.

"God."[1] Certainly, apart from all claims of inspiration, the application must be considered as very reasonable and apposite, by every attentive and impartial reader.

One would suppose that a man, not previously biassed either way, could hardly avoid falling in with the apostle James's application of a prophecy by Amos. "Simeon hath declared how God did "at the first visit the gentiles, to take out of them "a people for his name: and to this agree the "words of the prophets, as it is written, After this "I will return, and build again the tabernacle of "David, which is fallen down; and I will build "again the ruins thereof, and will set them up; "that the residue of men may seek after the "Lord, and all the gentiles, upon whom my name "is called, saith the Lord who doeth all these "things."[2] The variation of the Septuagint, whence for substance the quotation is made, from the Hebrew text, as it stands at present, does not at all affect the general meaning. But the reader may observe, that in Amos this prediction concerning the gentiles is introduced between a remarkable prophecy of the dispersion of Israel, as at this day, and another as remarkable a prediction of his restoration;[3] and that it is expressly connected with the kingdom of the Son of David.

Again, another prophet says, "The Lord will "famish all the gods of the earth; and men shall "worship him, every one from his place, even all

[1] Compare Hos. i. 10. ii. 23. with Rom. ix. 25, 26. 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10.
[2] Compare Amos ix. 11, 12. with Acts xv. 14—17.
[3] Amos ix. 9—15.

"the isles of the heathen."[1] Does not this foretell the conversion of gentiles to the worship of the true God, not at Jerusalem, but "every one "from his place?" and when shall this be, but under the reign of the Messiah?[2]

"Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion, for lo "I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, "saith the Lord; and many nations shall be "joined together to the Lord in that day, and "shall be my people; and thou shalt know that "the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee."[3] Who is the speaker in this prediction? Is not the Messiah? When he comes to the daughter of Zion, "many nations shall be joined to the "Lord, and become his people."—The passage, from the eighth of Zechariah has before been considered.

"From the rising of the sun unto the going "down thereof, my name shall be great among "the gentiles; and *in every place* incense shall "be offered unto my name, and a pure offering; "for my name shall be great among the hea- "then."[4]

To what times does this last of the ancient prophets refer in this prediction? Does he not evidently speak of the times of the Messiah? Under his reign, "the name of JEHOVAH shall be great "among the gentiles," and "*in every place*" acceptable worship shall be rendered; as acceptable as the incense and oblations at the temple, when presented in the most proper manner. But how

[1] Zeph. ii. 11. [2] Zeph. iii. 9. [3] Zech. ii. 10, 11. [4] Mal. i. 11.

can this be, if there is 'no Messiah for the 'Gentiles?'

"To him give all the prophets witness, that "through his name whosoever believeth in him "shall receive remission of sins."[1] "Is he the "God of the Jews only? is he not also of the gen- "tiles? Yes of the gentiles also."[2]—When it is considered that Israel, taken at his largest increase, through all generations hitherto, hath not formed one hundredth part of the human species, probably not above one third of that proportion; the mind revolts from the idea of the Creator wholly overlooking all the rest of mankind, and confining all his special favours to this single nation. Nothing could reconcile the man of reflection to this, but some clear proof that this favoured nation was, either *by nature*, or at least *by grace*, and in character, decidedly more holy and devoted to God, than other nations: but their whole scriptural history, and the testimonies of Moses and all the prophets, and even that of their own historian, decide against this. It would also be previously expected, in this case, that uniform preeminence in prosperity, as well as in piety, would have been conspicuous in all the annals of the nation: but the contrary to this has hitherto been the fact; and the whole term, from the calling of Abraham to this day, must constitute a vast proportion of the duration of the world, according to the scriptures.—If, however, the word of God had so decided it, though contrary to all analogy and

[1] Acts x. 43. [2] Rom. iii. 29.

reasoning, we ought to be silent, and, adore the depths, which we could not fathom: but, while a precedency of honour and distinction is reserved for Israel; it seems to be the clear tenour of scripture, that this precedency was not conceded merely for their own benefit; but, that they might be a blessing to the nations of the earth in general. "I will bless thee, and thou shalt be a blessing;" "In thee and in thy Seed shall all the families of "the earth be blessed." This Israel has been, and shall be, most eminently: and it might be thought this was more desirable and honourable, than a monopoly of blessings, with curses on all other nations on their account.

But Mr. C. is not apt to despair of his cause: and what it was impossible he could support out of the Old Testament, he attempts to prove from the New!

In quoting from St. Matthew, he inserts, 'but 'not the gentiles:' (p. 36. l. 10;) which is assuming the point in debate. The scribes did not consider the Messiah as the Messiah of the gentiles; and neither the prophet, nor the evangelist was speaking on that subject.

P. 36. l. 12. 'I am not sent.' &c. The personal ministry of Christ was intended to be principally among "the lost sheep of the house of Israel:" yet he healed the centurion's servant, and commended his faith; and added, "Many shall come "from the east, and from the west, and shall sit "down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in "the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the

" kingdom shall be cast out, into outer darkness, " where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."[1] He healed also the daughter of the woman of Canaan, and commended her faith.[2] He spent two days among the Samaritans.[3] He said expressly to the chief priests and elders, " the king- " dom of God shall be taken from you, and given " to a nation bringing forth the fruit thereof."[4] And his instructions to his apostles shew what he purposed, concerning his future church or kingdom.[5]—It would not be fair to argue with Jews from the New Testament, if they did not absurdly claim its authority, against the whole religion contained in it. But this assuredly can never serve their cause.

P. 36. l. 14. 'When the Son of man,' &c.—When our Lord said to his apostles, "Ye shall sit " on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of " Israel;"[6] he was so far from exclusively assigning the blessings of his kingdom to Israel, that he predicted the condemnation of Israel, by the testimony and judgment of his apostles.[7]

P. 36. l. 23 'Christ forgot the whole world,' &c. —What has already been stated sufficiently answers this; especially his commission, given to the apostles,[8] and his account of the day of judgment.[9]

P. 36. l. 31. 'Neither Christ,' &c.—By far the

[1] Matt. viii. 5—13. [2] Matt. xv. 21—28. [3] John iv. 39—42.
[4] Matt. xxi. 43. [5] Matt. xxviii. 19—20. Mark xvi. 15, 16. Luke xxiv. 47. [6] Matt. xix. 28. [7] 1 Cor. vi. 1—6.
[8] Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Mark xvi. 15, 16. Luke xxiv. 47.
[9] Matt. xxv. 31—46.

greater part of the history of Christianity, in the Acts of the apostles, and the apostolical epistles, relates to the gentiles. But let the reader consult the passages referred to.[1]

It does not appear why the quotation from Philippians was brought in, (p. 37. l. 1;) except to introduce the assertion that follows; which would have stood quite as well alone as with this introduction.

P. 37. l. 5. 'Hitherto we have proved,' &c.—I trust the contrary to all this has been *fully proved:* namely, That the Messiah is come; that the Messiah was predicted as 'the Messiah of the gentiles,' as well as of Israel; that Jesus was the promised Messiah; and that he is "over all, God "blessed for evermore."

P. 37. l. 13. 'I am sent only to the house of 'Israel,' &c. "I am not sent, but to the lost "sheep of the house of Israel." These are our Lord's words in the passage referred to.[2] His personal ministry, and his commission to his apostles, have already been considered: and it will hereafter be fully shewn that "the house of Israel," including and principally signifying the rulers, priests, and teachers of Israel; that is, "the blind guides," false teachers, and hypocritical wicked rulers of Israel; means something vastly different from "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." He was sent "to the lost sheep," and not to the wicked shepherds "of Israel;" through whose crimes the people were "as sheep not having a shepherd."[3]

[1] Rom. iii. 29. ix. 24—32. x. 12—21. xi. 11—13. 1 Thes. ii. 16, 17. [2] Matt. xv. 24. [3] Mark vi. 34.

P. 37. l. 15. 'Why did they not believe in 'him?' Answer, "Because they had not the love "of God in them:" "Because they received "honour one of another, and sought not the "honour which cometh from God only:" and "Because they loved the praise of men, more than "the praise of God."[1] Because of the ambition, avarice, enmity against God, and wickedness of their hearts and lives.

P. 37. l. 17. 'Whose word will stand,' &c.—I know not how Mr. C. means to apply this: but certainly the unbelief of the Jews, when the Messiah came, fulfilled and established "the words of "God," as spoken by the ancient prophets.[2] This will be shewn more fully hereafter: at present let it be noticed, that Zechariah distinguishes between the "poor of the flock, that waited" on the Messiah; or "the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" and all the rest of Israel, especially the pastors of the flock.

P. 37. l. 91. 'When Moses,' &c. Did the Israelites so unreservedly welcome Moses, when God sent him to them, as to give Mr. C. a ground of glorying on that account? The narrative given us by Moses himself, and the language of all the prophets, exhibit a widely different view of the subject. The mission of Moses was expressly for the purpose of bringing Israel, as a nation, out of Egypt; their conduct therefore was not permitted wholly to defeat this design. "But," says God by Ezekiel, "they rebelled against me, and would

[1] John v. 42—44. viii. 38. 42—44. xii. 43. [2] Is. xlix. 4, 5, 7. liii. 1, 2. Zech. xi. 7—11. Mal. iii. 1, 2. Rom. iii. 3, 4.

"not hearken unto me: then I said, I will pour "out my fury upon them, to accomplish my anger "against them in the midst of the land of Egypt. "But I wrought for my name's sake, that it should "not be polluted before the heathen."[1] And Moses, having numbered up many of the rebellions of Israel, concludes by saying, "Ye "have been rebellious against the Lord from "the day that I knew you."[2] Nothing but the terrific displays of the divine glory, and dreadful miracles, by which thousands at a time were destroyed, proved sufficient to curb their revolting and rebellious spirit; and to deter them from stoning Moses, and returning to Egypt: so that the event was, that the generation which God brought out of Egypt fell in the wilderness, by the awful judgments of God, notwithstanding the persevering intercessions of Moses and Aaron for them.[3] This was also expressly the punishment of their *unbelief*: "Yea, they despised the pleasant "land, they *believed* not his word."[4] Even a candid Jew, who has well studied the books of Moses and the prophets, must allow that Stephen had scriptural ground for saying to the rulers of Israel, "Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in "heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy "Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which "of the prophets have not your fathers perse-"cuted?"[5] except as he concluded by applying it to their conduct towards Jesus of Nazareth. This

[1] Ez. xx. 8, 9. [2] Deut. ix. 24.
[3] Ex. v. xxxii. Num. xi. xiii. xiv. xvi. xxv.
[4] Deut. i. 32. ix. 23. Ps. cvi. 24—27. Heb. iv. 18, 19.
[5] Acts vii. 51, 52.

might be urged much further,[1] but I forbear. The argument, if it prove any thing, proves that the mission of any one who professed to be the Messiah must be tried, whether it were of God or not, by the *national* reception with which he met; and not by the credentials which he produced that he was indeed sent by God: or, that no demonstration could have been sufficient, had the Jewish rulers and people persisted in unbelief. By the fulfilment of ancient prophecies; by stupendous miracles of mercy; by the coincidence of his instructions with those of Moses and the prophets; by the most perfect example of holiness; and by the subsequent most astonishing and beneficial effects even to this day; God has said, 'This is the 'Messiah;' "This is my beloved Son, in whom I "am well pleased, hear ye him."

P. 37. l. 24. 'But Israel said, No.' And Israel's word is, according to Mr. C. to prevail against the word of God.

P. 37. l. 26. 'To what purpose,' &c? "But "what if some did not believe, shall their unbelief "make the word of God of none effect? God "forbid." To what purpose was Moses sent to Pharaoh, to demand the liberation of Israel, when God had said, "I am sure that the king of Egypt "will not let you go; no, not by a mighty "hand?"[2] To what purpose did God commission Isaiah to "go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, "but understand not; and see ye indeed, but "perceive not; make the heart of this people

[1] Is. liii. 1, 2. Rom. iii. 3.

[2] Exod. iii. 19.—Comp. ix. 16, 17.

"fat," &c.?"[1] When Mr. C. has answered these questions, he will have answered his own. Many and important ends were answered, even respecting the unbelieving Jews, and the glory of God in his dealings with them, as an instruction to the whole world, by the coming of the Messiah to them; though God *foreknew*, and *foretold*, that the bulk of the nation would not believe in him. But objections of this kind are not started by Jews alone: for multitudes of nominal Christians seem to be the dupes of them; though in fact they are absurd and impious in the extreme. Upon the supposition that God foreknew the perverse and ruinous use which men would make of his gifts, of whatever kind; they, in language as remote as possible from reverence of his holy name, either expressly, or by consequence, charge him with having done wrong in conferring them. Thus, for instance, we frequently hear an objection started against 'thanking God for our 'creation,' because he foreknew that to multitudes creation would, through their own wickedness, become a curse. "It had been good for "that man, if he had never been born." Thus they transfer the guilt from those who pervert the goodness of God by their crimes to their own destruction, unto God who foresaw that they would do this! How deeply this kind of reasoning *infects* the speculations of men, in controversies concerning the distinguishing and undeserved mercies of God to some of our fallen

[1] Is. vi. 9, 10.—Comp. Matt. xiii. 14, 15. John xii. 38—40. Acts xxviii. 25—27.

race above others, must here be only hinted. In many cases it forms the grand hinge on which the controversy turns. But how could these things be otherwise, unless God were not omniscient, or not the moral and providential Governor of the universe?

P. 37. l. 27. 'Did God intend?' &c. "He "shall be for a sanctuary: but for a stone of "stumbling, and a rock of offence to both the "houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the "inhabitants of Jerusalem; and many among "them shall stumble, and fall, and be snared, "and taken."[1] The answer, contained in these words, does not depend on our interpretation of them.[2] However explained, they prove that God did appoint events in his providence, which he foreknew, and foretold, would be "a stone of "stumbling, and rock of offence to both the "houses of Israel."[3]

P. 37. l. 30. 'The word of God came to nothing,' &c. It has already been shewn, that the 'word of 'God,' as it related to the Messiah, and as fulfilled in Jesus, did not 'come to nothing;' but produced effects of most prodigious amplitude, and most beneficial and enduring consequences to the human race at large. But the second and third clauses of this passage are certainly true; 'the 'Messiah' (even the true Messiah) 'was despised 'and rejected, and lost his life.' It would too much interrupt our argument to take up the subject in this place: but I shall hereafter illus-

[1] Is. viii. 13—15. [2] Rom. ix. 32, 33. xi. 8—11. 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8.
[3] Comp. Ps. cxviii. 22, 23. Matt. xxi. 42—45. Acts iv. 11.

trate the apostle's words, by inductions from the prophets, " Him, being delivered by the deter-" minate counsel and fore-knowledge of God, " ye have taken, and by wicked hands have " crucified and slain; whom God hath raised up, " having loosed the pains of death," &c:[1] or, rather the words of our Lord himself, " Thus it is " written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, " and to rise from the dead the third day."[2] In this especially 'the scriptures of the prophets' were fulfilled; and in this all the grand ends of the Messiah's coming were accomplished, and could not have been effected, *according to the prophets*, in any other way.[4]

P. 37. l. 33. 'We also learn,' &c. The words of the apostle Paul are entirely coincident with the several prophecies of the Old Testament, which he quotes:[4] and therefore the charge brought against him falls on David and Isaiah; or rather on the Holy Spirit who spake by them. Men first proudly and wickedly close their own eyes against the truth, in determined unbelief; and then God, as a punishment, shuts them up in unbelief.

P. 38. l. 7. 'Had Israel,' &c. The unbelief of Israel was merely the *occasion*, not the *cause*, of the calling of the gentiles, which had been predicted from the time when the distinction between Abraham with his seed and the gentiles commenced.

[1] Acts ii. 23, 24. [2] Luke xxiv. 46.

[3] Ps. xxii. lxix. Is. liii. Dan. ix. 24—27. Zech. xiii. 7.

[4] Ps. lxix. 22—28. Is. vi. 9, 10. xxix. 40. Rom. xi. 7—10.

P. 38. l. 11. 'Israel was to be made guilty,' &c. If '*to be made guilty*' means 'to be brought 'in guilty as a criminal by a just verdict,' God 'made Israel guilty:' but they themselves committed, wilfully and obstinately, the crimes by which they exposed themselves to this righteous condemnation. Yet it has been shewn, that an immense number "of the lost sheep of the house "of Israel" were previously gathered into his fold by the good Shepherd, who "came to seek and to "save that which was lost."

I must notice with decided disapprobation, the whole passage under consideration, as destitute of reverence towards God, and humility before him. However criminal the conduct of Israel was; however obstinate in rebellion, and most unreasonable in unbelief: still, if God "leave them to "their own hearts' lusts," and they reject the Messiah, and crucify him, and are punished for it; God 'did them wrong,' (p. 38. l. 14,) 'im-'posed on his creatures,' (l. 15,) destroyed them '*without cause*.' (l. 22.) Yet the Jews themselves have never been able to assign any other adequate *cause* of the unexampled miseries and degradation of their nation, for above one thousand seven hundred years. By the common voice of the rulers and people, when demanding the crucifixion of Jesus, they imprecated this vengeance on themselves; "His blood be upon us, "and on our children."[1] And so long as they proceed to "crucify him afresh, and put him to "open shame," by saying, 'he received due pun-

[1] Matt. xxvii. 25.

'ishment, for by the law he was guilty,' (p. 38. l. 29,) their dispersions and oppressions will continue. But, when "the Spirit of God shall be poured out "upon them," and they shall look with penitent sorrow, and humble faith, to "him whom they "have pierced;"[1] they shall be gathered, restored, and honoured, even far more than in times of old. The day when this shall take place, I firmly believe to be near at hand; and I earnestly long and pray for it, as the very crisis of the world, so to speak. In the full persuasion that such will be the event ere long, I have engaged in this argument, and desire to conduct it in a manner as conciliatory as regard to truth and holiness will permit; in hopes of being an instrument, in some small degree of effecting the happy revolution.

If it was the purpose of God that Israel as a nation should welcome the promised Messiah; and if it was previously revealed that they would; then, Israel, as a nation, will receive him (l. 25.) when he comes; and he has not yet come.

The text from Isaiah[2] (l. 31, &c.) certainly proves that the word of God shall accomplish *his* purpose, whatever that may be: but this does not inform us what that purpose is, at least in regard to Israel as a nation. Concerning the *secret* purposes of God we know nothing. He predicted that Israel as a nation would reject the Messiah, and be themselves for a long time excluded on that account.[3]

[1] Ezek. xx. 37, 38, 43, 44. Zech. xii. 9—14.
[2] Is. lv. 10, 11. [3] Is. xlix. 7. l. 1, 2. Hos. iii. 4, 5.

P. 39 l. 14. . 'When he is sent he will be the 'leader.' The Messiah, as leader of the company is not mentioned. In a preceding part of the chapter indeed he is, but not exactly so as to suit Mr. C.'s argument. "Behold, I have given him "for a witness to the people, a leader and com- "mander to the people. Behold thou shalt call "a *nation* that thou knowest not, and *nations* that "knew not thee, shall run unto thee, because of "the Lord thy God, and for the Holy One of "Israel, for he hath glorified thee." [1] The nations here spoken of must be the gentiles; and this is the only place in which Israel is mentioned throughout the chapter.

P. 39. l. 18. 'Who being,' &c. Here Mr. C. charges Jesus with wishing to set up for himself, and to be "equal with God:" (l. 21:) but in another passage he says, 'Jesus himself never 'thought of such a thing; therefore he called 'himself the Son of man: but had he thought 'that he was God, he would have called himself 'the Son of a woman.' (p. 17. l. 8.)—That Jesus did prosper and accomplish astonishing things has already been shewn. Mr. C. might have rendered his statement, in the next words, (p. 39. l. 24,) more convincing, if he could have quoted the words, which he puts into the mouth of the Messiah, from "the scriptures of the prophets," instead of "speaking them out of his own heart," and according to what he supposes will be the case.

P. 39. l. 29. 'Was the Messiah of the gentiles 'a prophet, or not?'—The questions concerning

[1] Is. lv. 4, 5.

our Lord's predictions will come before us, more regularly in another place. (p. 89, 90.) Indeed, after Mr. C. had decided that Jesus was justly put to death, the question itself seems to come too late. The clause however from the seventy-fourth Psalm requires a brief notice. (p. 39. l. 32.) It is plain, from the whole of this Psalm, that it was written at a time, or at least that it referred to a time, when the sanctuary lay in ruins.[1] Either this was during the Babylonish captivity, or after the destruction of the temple by the Romans. If it related to the Babylonish captivity, it can be nothing to the purpose; for several prophets arose subsequent to that event. If it refer to the times following the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; it does most affectingly describe the state of the Jews during above seventeen centuries: but, as Jesus lived, and died, and arose again, many years before the destruction of the second temple, it can prove nothing against his character as a Prophet; for it relates exclusively to subsequent times.

P. 40. l. 12. The prophecy of Daniel has been considered; but "the sealing up of the vision "and prophecy," or "Prophet," relates to times three or four hundred years subsequent to Malachi; namely to the end of the seventy weeks, which Christians calculate to have been about the time of the crucifixion of Jesus. Mr. C. computes them to end, either with the death of king Agrippa and his son Monves, or at the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. There was no prophet

[1] Ps. lxxiv. 3—9.

in Israel, from Malachi, till near the times of Jesus; but the scripture does not say there never would be any: and, however satisfied Mr. C. may be on the subject, the scribes, and priests, and elders, in our Lord's time, confessed that they did not know whether John the Baptist was a prophet or not.

P. 40. l. 20. 'One thing,' &c.—If this proposition can be established, the business is settled: for, as Israel is not restored, if 'the restoration of 'Israel, and the coming of the Messiah be the 'same thing,' it is plain that the Messiah is not come! Indeed, if 'the Messiah is Israel and 'Israel the Messsiah,' (l. 23, 24.) then the Messiah came, when God surnamed Jacob by the name of Israel; the Messiah is now dispersed throughout the earth; the Messiah is to be *restored*, and not to *restore* others. What Mr. C. means by this, I know not: but, if he speaks the language of his nation, it proves that the Jews are apt to think of themselves *as the whole world;* and that nothing is of much consequence, in the dispensations of Providence, except as it tends to the aggrandisement of their nation.

P. 40. l. 25. 'The next,' &c.—It has generally been thought that Elias, or Elijah, the prophet, either personally, or by one "in his spirit and "power," would precede the coming of the Messiah. This the prophets foretold;[1] and this the ancient Jews fully expected.[2] But, not to dwell on this, Mr. C. *here* allows that the Messiah will be a prophet: and we allow that, if Jesus were

[1] Is. xl. 3—9. Mal. iii. 1. iv. 3, 4. [2] John i. 19—28.

not the Messiah, he could not be a prophet; and, from the fulfilment of the prophecies of Jesus, we draw a most conclusive argument that he was the Messiah. With whom then does Mr. C. contend; when, assuming that 'Jesus was not the Messiah,' he attempts to prove, 'that he was not a prophet?' Not with Christians certainly. But, in truth, the fulfilment of our Lord's prophecies stands very much in the way of the Jews; and they seem sometimes to have *great misgivings* on the subject; and almost to say among themselves: 'If not the Messiah, but a deceiver, how could he be a prophet? And, if not a prophet, how could he predict the state of Jerusalem, and of the Jews, for so many hundred years to come, and with such wonderful particularity?' This obstruction Mr. C. repeatedly labours to remove; but, I must think, completely without success.—The reader must determine, whether the right interpretation of the prophecy in Joel is given by the apostles, or by Mr. C. (l. 28.) [1] One thing should be noted, that, after the prediction "of the pouring out of "the Spirit," and its effects, it is added, "I will "shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, "blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke; the sun "shall be turned into darkness, and the moon "into blood, before the great and terrible day of "the Lord come." [2] The extraordinary appearances in the heavens would be presages of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, and of the subversion of the Jewish church and state; which

[1] Joel ii. 28—32. Acts ii. 16—21. Rom. x. 11—15.
[2] Joel ii. 30, 31.

would be attended by immense bloodshed, terrible conflagrations, and "pillars of smoke," such as ascend from the flames of burning cities. Now is not this a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and of the dissolution of the civil and ecclesiastical state of the Jews, with dreadful massacres, and miseries? Yet this is predicted as *subsequent* to "the pouring out of "the Spirit:" and only a remnant would be rescued from these tremendous judgments. The events predicted in the New Testament, and recorded in Josephus's History of the Wars of the Jews, confirm this interpretation. The third chapter of Joel contains a prediction of Israel's restoration, but the second predicts those events which made it necessary.

P. 41. l. 5. 'Thus far,' &c. Mr. C.'s *inferences*, at least, are not deficient in perspicuity and decision.

P. 41. l. 7. 'The gentiles' question.—Only 'one,' &c.

P. 41. l. 10. 'The answer of the Jews.—Mir-'acles,' &c. This and the following pages suggest a most important question—How FAR AND IN WHAT CASES, MIRACLES ARE THE PROOF OF A DIVINE MISSION? But, before we proceed to the more direct answer to it, a few particulars require a cursory notice.

P. 41. l. 17. 'The wise men of Pharaoh performed also the same miracles,' &c. Indeed! The magicians *imitated*, or rather *aped*, a few of Moses's miracles; whether by Satanical aid or not, or by what power, forms no part of our present question. Their rods were turned into serpents,

as well as his: but his rod devoured their's, and their rods disappeared. When, at the word of Moses, the waters of Egypt had been turned into blood, they also turned into blood a little of the water, which the mercy of God had spared: but, to equal the miracle of God by Moses, they should have turned the rivers, and reservoirs, and streams of blood throughout the land into water. They added to the plague of frogs; but they could do nothing towards removing it. They could neither produce lice, nor remove the disgusting and mortifying plague; but were forced to confess, "This "is the finger of God."[1] "The boil was upon the "magicians," as well as upon the other Egyptians; and they "could not stand before Moses."[2] Thus they were driven with contempt from the field of contest, and are no more mentioned by Moses.—But why did God thus display the superior power of the miracles wrought by Moses, in the sight of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, if 'mir-'acles be no proof of a divine mission?' Why did he work one miracle after another, in proof of this, if the miracles wrought did not prove it? Why did Moses afterwards, in the wilderness, appeal to the miracle about to be wrought, in the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram? "If "these men die the death of all men, or if they "be visited after the visitation of all men, then "the Lord hath not sent me: but if the Lord "make a new thing,[3] and the earth open her "mouth, and swallow them up, with all that ap-

[1] Exod. viii. 19. Luke xi. 20. [2] Exod. ix. 11. 2 Tim. iii. 8, 9.
[3] See Jer. xxxi. 22.

"pertain unto them, and they go down quick "into the pit; then ye shall understand that "these men have provoked the Lord."[1] And why did Elijah, (having put the proof of the important cause, whether JEHOVAH or Baal were God, on the answer by fire,) thus address the Lord—"Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, "let it be known this day, that thou art God in "Israel, and that I am thy servant, and have done "all these things at thy word?"[2] Why, I say, did he make such an appeal, if 'miracles be no 'proof of a divine mission?' The miracles of Moses were wrought by the power of God; those of the magicians by their enchantments.

P. 41. l. 22. 'To drive devils,' &c. Whatever credit may be attached to Josephus's narrative, no doubt exorcists among the Jews cast out devils in some instances, or induced them to go out. But, even in this respect, the miracles of Christ were so vastly superior, and so stupendous, that the people said, "It was never so seen in Israel:" and the Pharisees were compelled to allege, that he "cast out devils by Beelzebub the prince of "the devils."[3] It must be evident that evil spirits cannot be *constrained* to quit their hold of a man, in any way, except by a superior power.[4] This superior power 'a common man' has not: (l. 23:) either God or angels must help him, or the devil must retire from motives of policy.

P. 41. l. 25. 'They have even the power,' &c. I do not here presume to determine, what evil

[1] Num. xvi. 29, 30. See also 1 Sam. xii. 16—18.
[2] 1 Kings xviii. 36, 37. [3] Matt. ix. 32—34. xii. 22—24.
[4] Matt. xii. 29, 30.

spirits are or are not able to perform, or discover, or foretel by sagacity or conjecture, as far as God may see good to permit; or how far all divination, fortune-telling, and sorcery have been from *Satanical* agency, or from *human* imposture. But the power and foresight of evil spirits must have limits; they cannot be *infinite:* and, when the apostle in the name of Jesus, cast out the spirit from the Pythoness;[1] and when he terminated the enchantment, so that the effect was manifest both to the enraged masters, and to the multitude; and when he silenced the prophetess by a single word: it was sufficient proof of superior power and authority.

P. 42. l. 1. 'These two men,' &c. Mr. C. informs us that he learned the additional particulars, which he relates concerning Jamnes and Jambres, from tradition: and it may amuse the reader to learn, that Mohammed, perhaps on as good authority, records, that they were converted, and cruelly martyred by Pharaoh.—I do not clearly understand Mr. C.'s language, 'Symbols,[2] they also 'prophesied, but all by the works of the devil.' (l. 3.) The number, however, of well authenticated undeniable miracles, wrought publicly, before powerful enemies, in proof of a religion not yet established in authority, will, on investigation, be found very few indeed. Impostures in abundance are recorded; and some ambiguous events, which, whether they arose from human, or Satanical delusion, may admit of a doubt: but nothing

[1] Acts xvi. 16—19. [2] Read *Sybils.* See Note, p. 42.—J. S.

can be adduced which will bear a comparison with the miracles of Christ, any more than those of the Egyptian magicians could with the miracles of Moses. 'None of them can say, I command that 'a fire shall come down from heaven: none of 'them can say, I command the sun to stand still.' (l. 7.) May we not add, None could say, to one who had been four days dead, "Lazarus, come "forth." None could say to the winds and waves, in a tremendous storm: "Peace, be still, and there was a great calm."

There was no occasion for our Lord to command "the sun to stand still;" unless for the purpose of ostentation, or to gratify the wicked presumption of the scribes and Pharisees: nor would there have been any propriety in calling for fire from heaven, by him "who came to save and not to destroy." But the sun was darkened, and the promised land became as Egypt in the plague of darkness, while the lands of the gentiles were as Goshen, when Jesus was suspended on the cross.

P. 42. l. 15. 'There shall be no sign,' &c. Let the reader compare the words of Matthew, with those here quoted from Mark: "An evil and adul-"terous generation seeketh after a sign; and there "shall no sign be given it, but the sign of the "prophet Jonas."[1] The sign, which our Lord gave the Jews, was that of his own resurrection on the third day; which, as predicted and accomplished, to the confusion and silencing of his powerful enemies, and as connected with its ex-

[1] Matt. xii. 38—40. xvi. 1—4.

tensive and permanent effects, was immensely more conclusive, than any transient "sign from "heaven" could have been.

P. 42. l. 19. 'It was his duty,' &c. Our Lord, in his character of the Ambassador, or Apostle, of the Father, was required, and if such language must be used, concerning "the Lord of all," 'it 'was his *duty*,' to "fulfil the will of him who "sent him;" but not to gratify the unreasonable demands of those to whom he was sent; who "hated both him and his Father." God gives that kind and degree of evidence which he knows to be suitable and sufficient; and not such as his rebellious subjects may insolently require.—"Nay, "father Abraham, but if one went unto them from "the dead, they will repent: and he said unto "them, If they believe not Moses and the pro-"phets, neither would they be persuaded, though "one rose from the dead."[1] They, who said, "Let "Christ the King of Israel descend from the cross, "that we may see and believe;" "Let him come "down from the cross, and we will believe him;" (a demand subversive of the whole design, for which he came into the world, as predicted throughout the Old Testament;) were by no means disposed to believe in him, when he just after "arose from "the dead."

Moses did not work such miracles as either Pharaoh or Israel prescribed to him: but such, and such only, as God directed him to work. He who teaches the prophet his *duty*, in the execution of his prophetical office, prescribes the conduct,

[1] Luke xvi. 29—31.

which he presumptuously thinks ought to have been adopted by God himself. The false prophets were the *compliant* persons; not Elijah, Micaiah, and the other true prophets.[1]

P. 43. l. 10. 'Moses the Lord of,' &c.—The reader must determine, how properly Moses, or any mere man can be called 'the Lord of all the 'prophets.'

P. 43. l. 16. From the statement given in this passage, it might be supposed, that God *first* commissioned Moses to work miracles before the people; but that because Moses knew that this would 'not be sufficient to convince them' of his being 'sent by God,' "the token" was *afterwards* added. Whereas the token was *first* given; and, it seems, Moses supposed that *it* would be insufficient, and therefore, the commission to work miracles was added. Indeed the whole passage in Mr. C. is a reversal of the order, in which the narrative by Moses is arranged.

But let that narrative speak for itself. "Moses "said unto God, Who am I, that I should go unto "Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the chil- "dren of Israel out of Egypt? And he said, cer- "tainly I will be with thee; and this shall be a "token unto thee, that I have sent thee, when "thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt "ye shall serve God upon this mountain."[2] "This shall be *a token unto thee*;" namely, for his own satisfaction, as one who believed the promise

[1] Ahab's messenger wanted to teach Micaiah his *duty*, or more modestly, to counsel him; but he received his answer. 1 Kings xxii. 13, 14.

[2] Ex. iii. 11, 12.

of God. It does not appear that the people were made acquainted with it; and his *asserting* that God had spoken this to him, would not be any proof *to them* of his divine mission.—Afterwards, "Moses answered and said, But behold they will not "believe me, nor hearken to my voice; for they "will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee. "And the Lord said unto him, What is that in "thy hand? and he said, a rod. And he said, "Cast it on the ground. And he cast it on the "ground, and it became a serpent; and Moses "fled from before it. And the Lord said unto "Moses, Put forth thine hand, and take it by the "tail. And he put forth his hand, and caught it, "and it became a rod in his hand: *That they may* "*believe* that the Lord God of their fathers, the "God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God "of Jacob, hath appeared unto thee.—And the "Lord said furthermore unto him, Put now thy "hand into thy bosom. And he put his hand "into his bosom: and when he took it out, behold, "it was as leprous as snow. And he said, Put "thine hand into thy bosom again. And he put "his hand into his bosom again; and plucked it "out of his bosom, and, behold, it was turned "again as his other flesh. And it shall come to "pass, if they will not believe thee, neither hearken "to the voice of the first sign, *that they will be-*"*lieve* the voice of the latter sign. And it shall "come to pass, if they will not believe also these "two signs, neither hearken to thy voice, that thou "shalt take of the water of the river, and pour it

[1] Ex. iv. 1—9, 29—31.

"out on the dry land; and the water which thou "takest out of the river shall become blood upon "the dry land."—"And Moses and Aaron went "and gathered together all the elders of the chil- "dren of Israel. And Aaron spake all the words "which the Lord had spoken unto Moses, and did "the signs in the sight of the people. And the "people believed."[1] It must now be clearly ascertainable, whether the *token*, or the *miracles*, were the ground on which the people were required to believe Moses.

The sign to Moses, that "God would certainly "be with him," was a *private and personal token:* but his public miracles proved that JEHOVAH had sent him, and established him as a prophet, both to Israel and to Pharaoh. Indeed Pharaoh and the Egyptians were destroyed, and a most important part of Moses's commission, as a prophet, was accomplished, before Israel came to Horeb. The same kind of reasoning which Mr. C. adopted concerning Jesus, may lead us to ask, Of what use then were the miracles of Moses to Pharaoh and the Egyptians? or the establishment of Moses as a prophet, or his subsequent miracles, to the rebels who afterwards perished by thousands? or to that whole generation which fell in the wilderness? Yet these miracles answered great and important purposes, both to Israel, to the surrounding nations, and to all subsequent generations, even to this day.

P. 44. l. 2. 'Established Moses,' &c :—l. 24. 'All the miracles,' &c.—Notwithstanding Moses's establishment as a prophet at Horeb, the people,

[1] Ex. iv. 1—9, 29—31.

it seems, were so little satisfied respecting it, and so prone to murmur, if their desires were not immediately granted; that nothing but miracles of wrath could prevent their open rebellion against both the prophet, and God who sent him! This also shews, that the conduct of the Jews in rejecting Jesus is no proof that he was not the true Messiah: for, by exactly the same kind of evidence, it may be proved that Moses was not a true prophet? and this is at least a valid *argumentum ad hominem.*

P. 45. l. 4. 'Now to make them all fit,' &c.—The people after all confessed, that they were not able to hear the word of God.[1]

P. 45, l. 6. 'Became a whole nation, in one 'moment, prophets,' &c.—When the Lord appointed to Moses seventy assistants, he said "I "will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and "will put it upon them." "And he took of the "Spirit that was upon him, and gave unto the "seventy elders." "And Eldad and Medad pro-"phesied in the camp." "And Moses said, Would "God that all the Lord's people were prophets, "and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon "them!"[2] In this place alone do we read of God's "pouring out of his Spirit on Israel," to make any of them prophets; and this only on seventy out of the whole nation. Moses's wish, according to Mr. C.'s account, would have been superfluous and absurd.

P. 45. l. 9. 'We find that afterward,' &c.—Nothing is recorded in scripture of this kind,

[1] Ex. xx. 19. Deut. v. 23—27. [2] Num. xi. 17, 24—29.

concerning prophets in general; nor what entirely accords to it, respecting any particular prophet: but, as it does not affect the general argument, it does not require further notice. The same may be said of the rest of this page.

Let it here be distinctly observed, that Mr. C. admits the authenticity of the history, contained in the New Testament, concerning the ministry and miracles of Jesus, and of his apostles: at least he says nothing to the contrary, and he frequently appeals to it. Indeed, this is the only *original* history, extant in the world, of the introduction and establishment of Christianity. Neither friends nor enemies gave any other which has been preserved, and which can be referred to as *authority*. This is a most extraordinary, though little noticed, fact! The revolution, in itself the greatest, and productive of by far the most extensive, important, and permanent effects, in the history of the human race; occupies scarcely any pages in the writings of original historians, except those of the New Testament: all else is *tradition* or *report*. These books were written by Christians; and no contemporary opposer ventured to publish a counter narrative: though the credit of the Jewish rulers, priests, and scribes, and even that of pagan persecutors and philosophers, loudly demanded it of them! This is a testimony to the fidelity of the sacred historians of the New Testament, which is altogether without parallel. Even modern enemies to Christianity, are compelled to derive all their information from the evangelists themselves!

Let it be also observed, that Mr. C. does not

attempt to deny the *reality* of the miracles, recorded as wrought by Jesus and his apostles; but ascribes them unreservedly to witchcraft and enchantment: 'All by enchantment.' (P. 42. l. 6.) This is exactly the ancient solution of the difficulty given by the Pharisees; and our Lord's answer to it is worthy the consideration of moderns also who retain it.[1]

Having premised these things, we proceed more directly to the question,

HOW FAR, AND IN WHAT CASES, MIRACLES ARE A PROOF OF A DIVINE MISSION.

It is readily allowed, that 'bad and wicked men 'have wrought miracles;' (p. 46. l. 16;) yea, *real* miracles, by the power of God: for to be a *prophet*, and to be a *saint*, or *holy person*, are quite distinct things. No doubt, Judas wrought miracles, as well as the other apostles: and our Lord assures us that many instances will be made known at the day of judgment of miracles wrought in his name by "the workers of iniquity."[2]

It is also conceded, that wicked men, by various artifices of *legerdemain* imposing on the senses of the ignorant, may perform many things which appear to be miraculous; and the history of the church abounds with such "lying miracles," in which some knowledge of chemistry, or mechanics, or optics, and other sciences, combining with the tricks of a juggler, among illiterate people, and

[1] Matt. xii. 23—32. [2] Matt. vii. 21—23.

those, who were not permitted closely to investigate what they saw, gave reputation to appearances which passed for miracles; but in which neither divine power, nor diabolical operation, were at all concerned. This was clearly ascertained at the reformation from popery.—It appears also *to me* undeniable, that, by witchcraft and enchantment, the actual operation of evil spirits has been, in many instances, obtained: and thus *supernatural* effects have been produced; and the magicians of Egypt seem to have wrought their miracles, at least some of them, in this way: nor is it easy to say, which of the lying miracles of the antichristisn church have been wrought by human imposture, and which by Satanical influence.

In this view, however, it is worthy of notice, that the only formidable rival of Christianity on earth, Mohammedism, was established without any *public* miracles; and that Mohammed employs no small portion of the Koran in framing excuses for not giving signs and miracles in proof of his mission, and in intimidating those who demanded them. The only religions in the whole world, which so much as profess to have been *at first introduced, and established by miracles*, wrought in the presence of powerful opposers, and demanding investigation from the most learned, potent and sagacious of them, are that of Israel as contained in the Old Testament, and that of Jesus in the New. There never, in any age or place, was another religion *introduced* with this avowed claim. Miracles, said to have been wrought in support of a system already *established, and possessed of authority*; or by those, whose

rank or superiority, *in any respect*, precluded or discouraged free examination; are widely different from those wrought during the feeble infancy of a new religion, in the midst of opposition, by men in other respects obscure, challenging investigation, and forcing opponents to say, "This is "the finger of God;" "This man doeth many "miracles;" "That a notable miracle hath been "done by them is manifest to all, and we cannot "deny it:"[1] thus driving them to persecution, and to calumniate the most undeniable miracles as the effect of magic and enchantment.

It is further granted that there may be cases, in which those events that appear to us miracles are insufficient to prove a divine mission.—When the worship of the One living and true God alone had been established in Israel, by most stupendous miracles and invisible evidences, no sign or miracle was to be considered as any argument to authorize the worship of idols: for it could not possibly outweigh, nay it could not be worthy of comparison with, the demonstration already given to the contrary; but must be considered as a temptation.[2]

If therefore *real miracles* could be wrought in support of any doctrine, *manifestly* and *expressly* contrary to "the oracles of God;" they would not prove the truth of that doctrine. But the Lord has graciously so ordered it, that careful examination has hitherto sufficed to distinguish the *miracles*, by which new impostures have sprung up, almost like yearly almanacs, to have their

[1] Ex. viii. 19. John xi. 47. Acts iv. 16. [2] Deut. xiii. 1—4.

short notice, and the admiration of the superficial; and then, like almanacs out of date, to be neglected and forgotten; from such miracles as introduced the Mosaic dispensation, and afterwards the religion of Jesus Christ. Yet each of these successive impostures has deluded some, or many; and often they disgrace the cause of truth, and seem to weaken the credibility of scripture, through the sanction given to them by some ill-judging religious characters.

Were a few apparent, or even real miracles, the *only* proof, which Christians can adduce, in support of their holy religion: and could it be as easily proved, as it is confidently asserted, that this religion is subversive of that contained in the Old Testament; *plausibility* at least would be given to the arguments of a Jew against them. But it is observable, that, amidst all the stupendous miracles wrought by Jesus and his apostles, they every where appealed to the Old Testament; alleging that "thus it was written, and thus it "must be."[2]

In this respect Christianity has an important advantage above the Mosaic dispensation; because prophecies, during many ages introduced it: and not only were all other particulars respecting the Messiah and his kingdom, his laborious suffering life, and his violent death as a sacrifice for our sins, and his glorious resurrection and ascension,[3] predicted even with minuteness, but

[1] Deut. xiii. 1—4. [2] John v. 35—47.

[3] Ps. xvi. 8—10. lxviii. 18. Is. liii. 4—12. Dan. ix. 24—27. Zech. xiii. 7.

his very miracles also were foretold.[1] Thus Jesus, when John the Baptist sent to inquire of him, "Art thou He that cometh, or do we look for "another?" answered, "Go, and shew John "again, those things which ye do see and hear: "the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, "the lepers are cleansed, the dead are raised up, "and the poor have the gospel preached unto "them."[2] Whereas Moses could appeal to no preceding prophecies, as marking out any particulars of his mission.[3]

The religion of Moses, therefore, stands more singly on the demonstration of undeniable miracles, than that of Jesus does: and he who allows that Jesus wrote the miracles recorded of him, and his apostles those recorded of them, and then says, 'miracles are a poor and miserable defence,' &c, (p. 41. l. 10, 11,) does what in him lieth to undermine the authority and divine mission of Moses, and to give advantage to infidel opposers of the whole scripture.

Let it be observed also, that the two miracles which Mr. C. mentions, intimating that Jesus should have wrought them, (p. 42. l. 7,) were not performed by Moses; but by Joshua and Elijah, after the religion of Moses had been fully established.[4]

If Moses had gone to Israel and to Pharaoh exactly as he did in all other respects; if they had answered, "The Lord hath not appeared unto

[1] Is. xxix. 18. xxxv. 4—6. [2] Is. lxi. 1—3. Matt. xi. 4—6. Luke vii. 20—23. [3] Gen. xv. 13—16. Ex. xii. 40—42. [4] Josh. x. 12, 13. 1 Kings xviii. 22—38. 2 Kings i. 10—15.

"thee," and demanded some proof of his mission; and if he could have produced none, except the private token given to encourage his own faith, "This shall be a token *unto thee* that I have sent "thee, when thou hast brought forth this people "out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this "mountain:"[1] it may, I suppose, be spoken confidently, that there would have been an end of the whole business; except that Pharaoh would have punished him as a deceiver, and have oppressed the people more severely for forming designs of recovering their liberty. The token would have come too late, either to induce Pharaoh to let the people go, or Israel to venture on leaving Egypt. —But when, in proof that Jehovah had sent him, Moses gave the appointed miraculous signs to the people; and when, by the lifting up, or the waving, of his shepherd's rod, the waters of Egypt were turned into blood; and tremendous judgments, denounced beforehand, followed one another in rapid succession; which were also removed at his word; the Lord God almighty bare witness to his mission; so that even Pharaoh and the Egyptians could not disprove it, or indeed doubt of it.

If, however, the magicians had been able, by their art, to remove each judgment at once, and to repair the damages of it, the case might have still remained doubtful: but when, after aping a few of his miracles, they were constrained to confess, "This is the finger of God;" when "the "boil was on them, as well as on the other "Egyptians;" and when they were driven away,

[1] Exod. iii. 12.

defeated, and covered with ignominy: the difference between Moses, who spake in the name of JEHOVAH, and these impotent contemptible jugglers, was fully demonstrated; and "their "folly was made manifest to all men."[1]

It is manifest, that Moses himself, and all the subsequent writers of the Old Testament, appeal to the miracles wrought in Egypt, at the Red Sea, and in the wilderness, as the foundation of their religion. Something has already been adduced on this topic, and I will not enlarge. "Hath "God assayed to go and take him a nation from "the midst of another nation, by temptations, by "signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a "mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm, and "by great terrors; according to all that the Lord "your God did for you before your eyes? Unto "thee it was shewed, that thou mightest know, "that the Lord he is God."[2]—"How long will "it be ere they believe me, for all the signs which "I have shewed among them?"[3] These miracles are also represented as exciting convictions in all the neighbouring nations, which were not forgotten for ages afterwards.[4]

It is readily allowed, that this was far from the only proof that the Lord spake by Moses: and careful examiners find decisive internal evidence of his divine legation, pervading the whole of the books written by him. The sublime and truly rational views of the nature, perfections, and

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 9. [2] Deut. iv. 34, 35.

[3] Num. xiv. 11. Comp. Mark ix. 19. John xii. 37. See also Num. xvi. 28—30. xvii. 2—10.

[4] Exod. xv. 14—16. Josh. ii. 9—11. 1 Sam. iv. 8.

works of God; and the history of the creation of the world; the holy, just, and good law, which Moses promulgated; the excellent *judgments*, or political laws, which he enacted, compared with those of other ancient legislators, nay, with modern codes of law, even in Christian countries; the sacramental prefigurations, in the ritual law, of "good things to come;" and the prophecies contained in his writings, and either fulfilled in past events, or fulfilling at this day, especially in the state of Israel; are a few of the other conclusive proofs that God spake by Moses.—His disinterestedness, and some laws and promises, which no politician would have committed himself upon, except conscious of delivering the word of God;[1] and even the obscurity of his own descendents; render his divine mission illustrious. Yet the whole was introduced and established by miracles; without which there would have been no opportunity of exhibiting the other evidences of his mission, or of calling the attention of Israel, or of mankind, to them.

In like manner, the holy nature of Christianity, in which all that has been noticed of the perfections and holy law of God, is still more clearly exhibited; and the success of such a holy religion, in this wicked and unholy world, by such means and instruments as have been considered; with innumerable internal proofs, and prophecies already fulfilled, and fulfilling at this day; not to dwell again on the prophecies of the Old Testament fulfilled in these events; constitute a full

[1] Exod. xxxiv. 24. Lev. xxv. 20—22.

proof, and moral demonstration, that Christianity is from God, even apart from the miracles of Jesus and his apostles: nay, the prevalence and continuance of his religion to this day, is more wonderful than any external miracle, or than all of them united. The tendency also of Christianity, yea, its actual effects, shewing that, if it universally prevailed, not in name and form, but in power and efficacy; if men did indeed repent, believe, love God, and love one another, according to its peremptory requirements; universal peace and felicity must be the consequence: this, I say, proclaims its divine original.

Yet the whole was introduced, and must have been introduced, by miracles, to excite the attention of the prejudiced Jews, and of a careless world; to force a temporary conviction, at least, even on its opponents; and to procure the preachers a patient hearing from those whom they addressed. Without this, no other evidences could have been so brought before men, as to obtain a fair investigation. In this respect, the case of the Mosaic, and that of the Christian dispensations are entirely similar.

The nature of our Lord's miracles also should be considered.—Mr. C. seems indeed favourable to tremendous and splendid miracles: and to "turn water into blood" was more suited to "the "law given by Moses;" but to "turn water into "wine" better accorded to him, by whom "grace "and truth came" to mankind. The power which in repeated instances raised the dead, was doubtless sufficient to strike dead the living opponents: and certainly, it ought not to be an objection to our

Lord's miracles, that he did not inflict, I will not say such miraculous judgments as desolated Egypt, but such as slew rebellious Israelites by thousands and tens of thousands, in the wilderness. When Jesus merely said "I am he," his numerous and powerful assailants "went backward, and fell "to the ground;"[1] and he shewed that his mild conduct in this respect did not arise from want of power. The special miracles wrought by Jesus, which accord to the predictions of the prophets, should not be overlooked.—No prophet or apostle, except the Lord Jesus, ever "opened the eyes of "the blind;" either of those who had been before known to be blind, or were born blind.[2] Nothing of this appears in the history of the Old Testament, or in the Acts of the apostles. The same may be said of his "unstopping the ears of the deaf, and "giving speech to the dumb." "He hath done "all things well; he maketh both the deaf to "hear, and the dumb to speak."[3] Not to dwell upon the suitableness of these miracles to be emblems of his salvation; it is plain that the predictions referred to never were accomplished but in him: and nothing could more explicitly point out the promised Messiah; for "unto many "that were blind he gave sight." (ἐχαρίσατο τὸ βλέπειν.)

He healed all manner of diseases, cleansed the lepers, raised the dead by a word spoken; rebuked a legion of evil spirits, and drove them out; "re-

[1] John xviii. 3—6. [2] Is. xxxv. 5, 6. John ix. 32.
[3] Mark vii. 32. Comp. Exod. iv. 11. Luke xxi. 15. Acts xxvi. 16—18.

"rebuked the winds and waves" in a violent storm, "and there was a great calm;" "walked upon "the waves of the sea:" and, to complete the whole, he shewed that he had "power to lay down "his life and power to take it again."

This last miracle was the grand sign given to that generation. It was predicted by the prophets; and so clearly foretold by Jesus himself, from the beginning of his ministry, that it was well known to the scribes, priests, and rulers: yet all their precautions were in vain; the body was gone, and their silence, after the bold and explicit testimony of the apostles to his resurrection, with the unqualified accusation of them, as the murderers of the Messiah, "the Prince of life," was a clear confession that they could adduce nothing against it. The testimony of twelve men of sober minds, good characters, and most evident disinterestedness; who had intimately known him for several years, and ate and drank with him after his resurrection, and saw him ascend towards heaven; was enough to prove any fact, not wholly impossible in the nature of things. In this testimony they all persevered, without one discordant voice, amidst labours, hardships, and persecutions, even until death; and most of them sealed it with their blood. Besides their testimony, very many others bare witness also; and the apostle Paul, several years after, could appeal to "to the greater part" of "five hundred" persons, who saw Jesus after his resurrection. But it was deemed proper to put the matter beyond all reasonable doubt: therefore, as if no human testimony was sufficient in such a cause, "God himself bare witness with

"signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, "and gifts of the Holy Ghost."[1] The gift of tongues, enabling unlearned men to speak fluently, and understand readily, the languages of all the nations to whom they addressed themselves; every miracle which the apostles wrought "in the name "of Jesus of Nazareth;" every instance in which, by the laying on of their hands, they conferred on others the gift of tongues and the power of working miracles, not only increased the number of witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus, but was *the attestation of God himself* to their testimony. Either the resurrection of our Lord must be disproved; or it must stand confirmed, I had almost said, beyond demonstration, that "Jesus is the "Christ, the Son of the living God."

Impostors have made many vain pretensions; but did any man, from the beginning of the world to this day, having rested the proof of his mission on this ground, 'Put me to death; and if I do not rise again on the third day, I am a deceiver:' I say, did any man ever *establish such a demonstration* of his mission, except Jesus of Nazareth? Why talk of magic and enchantment? What could these do in such a case as this?

It appears then, that miracles, public, undeniable miracles, wrought in the name of God, (as an express proof and confirmation of a doctrine not manifestly contrary to preceding revelations in essential matters; and not only destitute of human support, but even vehemently opposed by the powerful, sagacious, and learned, and by

[1] Heb. ii. 4.

the multitude,) are one grand evidence that God sent him who wrought them, and by them God himself authenticates the testimony; that they introduce and make way for all other proofs;—and that, when such changes as Christianity introduced, are to be effected in consequence, by unarmed instruments, and without human power or violence, they are almost, if not absolutely, indispensable.

When only a few of our Lord's miracles had been performed, they drew from a ruler and teacher in Israel the confession, in his own name and that of his companions, "Rabbi, we know "that thou art a teacher come from God: for no "man can do the miracles that thou doest, except "God be with him."[1] "Many of the people," also, "believed on him, and said, When Christ "cometh, will he do more miracles than this man "doeth?"[2] And the man born blind spoke unanswerably, when he said, "Herein is a marvellous "thing, that ye know not whence he is, and yet "he hath opened mine eyes. Since the world "began was it not heard that any man opened "the eyes of one that was born blind. If this "man were not of God, he could do nothing."[3] The council also felt the force of this proof, after Jesus had called Lazarus out of the grave. "What "do we? for this man doeth many miracles; and, "if we let him thus alone, all men will believe on "him."[4] After his resurrection, the testimony of the apostles produced the most embarrassing

[1] John iii. 1, 2.
[2] John vii. 31.
[3] John ix. 29—34.
[4] John xi. 47, 48.

difficulties to the opposing rulers: and they were induced to put the cause on another kind of trial, when Gamaliel had counselled, after introducing apposite examples, "Refrain from these men, and "let them alone; for if this counsel and work be "of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of "God, ye cannot overthrow it: lest haply ye be "found to fight against God."[1] According to the reasoning of this prudent opponent, trial has been made for much above seventeen hundred years; and, because Christianity is "of God," neither Jews nor gentiles, neither open enemies nor treacherous friends, have been able to overturn it, to this very day.—After all, no other religion, from the beginning of the world, except that of Moses, and that of Jesus, ever claimed to have been introduced and established by public miracles, as the testimony of God to the teacher and his doctrine. Popish miracles, heathen miracles, and Mohammedan miracles, accord in this, that they were wrought, or asserted to be wrought, in favour of a religion already established and possessed of authority, or public favour; were wrought privately, among friends; or at most before those, who dared not, or were not able, or were not inclined, to investigate their pretensions. There are, therefore, no other claimants in this cause; though some men speak as if such claims were *quite common things!* The miracles of Moses and of Jesus were as much superior to all the effects of magic and enchantment, as well as to those of human imposture, "as the heavens are above

[1] Acts v. 33—40.

"the earth." They stand on the same ground, and must be supported by the same arguments, and share the same fate. So that, if either Jew or Christian could succeed in discrediting the miracles of Moses or of Jesus, as God's attestation to the divine mission of either of them; every shrewd opposer of both, would perceive his advantage, and fight him with his own weapons: nay, the attempt itself would tend to universal scepticism.

P. 46. l. 18. 'The authority,' &c. The quotations, though inaccurate, on this page do not affect the main question. But, if the Messiah is to be only an earthly, and not a spiritual Deliverer; what connexion can his coming, and the restoration of Israel, have with "the circumcision of the "heart to love the Lord?" (p. 47. l. 12.) Is not this a *spiritual* blessing? Or what does Mr. C. suppose to be meant by it? Does he, with many writers concerning Christian baptism, suppose the sign and the thing signified to be the same, or inseparably connected with each other?

P. 47. l. 20. 'Let every one observe,' &c.—The law of Moses, undeniably, contains three distinct kinds of precepts, *moral*, *ceremonial*, and *judicial*. The *moral* law is contained in the ten commandments; summed up in the two great commandments of "loving God with all the "heart," and "our neighbour as ourselves;" and explained and enforced by every precept or exhortation in scripture, requiring piety, justice, temperance, inward purity, truth, and love. The

ceremonial law comprises all instituted worship, and the whole of the external observances, respecting sacrifices, festivals, distinction of meats, purifications, and various things; neither arising from the nature of God and man, and men's relation to God and one another, nor previously obligatory. The *judicial* laws were the magistrate's rule of civil government. Of the two last, it may be questioned whether they be now in force or not: but it is manifest, that they have not been, as to the most essential parts of them, obeyed since the destruction of the temple, and the dispersion of the Jews; nor can they be obeyed in the present state of the nation. The ceremonial institutions, not being previously obligatory, might be abolished by the same authority as instituted them. Christians consider them "as "having been shadows of good things to come;" and, having now answered their end, and received their accomplishment, as disannulled, and of no validity: and it appears to us that this was intimated with sufficient clearness by the ancient prophets.[1] Several of the prophets, also, allowed of deviations from the ritual law, and set the example of them, with acceptance from God, in peculiar circumstances: as Elijah and Elisha, and the other prophets, who were sent to the ten tribes; and who neither went themselves, nor required the pious remnant of Israelites, to go up to Jerusalem to worship: and they always marked strongly the superiority of moral to ritual obe-

[1] Psalm xl. 6—8. Comp. Heb. x. 1—9. Jer. xxxi. 31—34. Comp. Heb. viii. 8—13.

dience.[1] Now that which is *inferior* in excellency cannot be of the same nature, and of the same immutable obligation, as that which is *superior*, and to which it must give place, when they interfere with each other. "I desired mercy, and not "sacrifice."[2]

The judicial laws were framed with an equity, wisdom, mildness, and benevolence, which mark their divine original: but they were so specially accommodated to Israel, as under a Theocracy, that they could not be adapted to the political government of nations, in different circumstances; though the spirit of them might be very advantageously infused into, perhaps, every code of laws on earth.

But the moral law is unchangeable, as to its substantial requirements, in its own nature; the gospel establishes it, in its full authority, both by the obedience and atonement of Immanuel, by giving it as a rule of duty to all called Christians, and by writing it in the heart of all who are really Christians; thus leading them to love and delight in it, to repent of every transgression of it; and to breathe out the constant prayer, "Oh, that my "ways were directed to keep thy statutes!"

Many professed Christians, and teachers, speak of 'the law being abolished,' and of a *better*, a *new*, and *mitigated* law being introduced by Christianity: but, as I believe this to be the most *general of all heresies*, and one of the most *destructive both to law and gospel*, I shall only say

[1] Ps. l. 23. li. 16, 17. Is. i. 10—18. lxvi. 3. Jer. vii. 21—23. Hos. vi. 6. Amos v. 21—24. [2] Hos. vi. 6.

concerning it, "Let Baal plead for himself." The notion undermines the very doctrine of redemption, and hides its glory; it makes void the holy, just, and good law of God; and gives the Jew one of his most plausible arguments against Christianity.

P. 47. l. 29. 'The law of Moses is perfect,'—Each of these laws cannot be *perfect* in exactly the same sense, or the one never could have been preferred before the other. Each of them is *perfect*, as entirely suited for the purpose for which God intended it. But, if God intended the *moral* law as the complete and unchangeable standard of holiness, and rule of duty, to all his worshippers under every dispensation, according to which also he will judge the world: if he intended the *ritual* law as a temporary rule for instituted worship, a wall of separation to preserve Israel from apostacy to idolatry, and from being lost among idolaters, by familiar intercourse with them; and as a shadow of good things to come: and if he intended the *judicial* law for the political law of Israel, under the theocracy: the perfection of each, to answer these several intentions, could not be precisely the same.—Now *absolute* perfection must be entirely the same, wherever it exists; that is, in God alone: *relative* perfection, in the fullest sense, belongs to all his works, as he made them; not more to an angel than to Adam, or the lower creation, or any part of it. "God saw every thing that he had made, "and behold it was very good."[1] "As for God,

[1] Gen i. 31.

" his work is perfect :" yet the perfection of the human body does not consist in all being one member ; but in the completeness and symmetry of the whole, consisting of many members, each perfectly fitted to its place and office.

P. 48. l. 12. ' I have produced,' &c. Perfectly satisfied with the testimonies from Moses and from David, when soberly interpreted, we have no desire to bring forward any witnesses to oppose them. If indeed there were any contrariety, we might point out Immanuel, and say, " Behold " a greater than Moses, than David is here!" " I am one that bear witness of myself; and the " Father that sent me beareth witness of me." The apostles also concur in his testimony; and so doth " the Holy Spirit, which God hath given to " them that obey him."[1] But there is no *contrariety*; yea, rather there is the most entire coincidence.

P. 48. l. 27. ' These two tables contained the ' whole law.'—Then the *ceremonial* and *judicial* law form no part of that in behalf of which Mr. C. is pleading ; for the ten commandments alone were written on the two tables of stone. And, in that case, I have no further controversy with him on this part of the subject.

P. 48. l. 28. ' In the ten,' &c. I should probably labour in vain, did I attempt to advise Christians to count the letters of the ten commandments; and to compare them with the number of precepts, of every sort and kind, in the law of Moses. Will not reasonable Jews allow this to be egregious

[1] Matt. xii. 41, 42. John viii. 13—18. xv. 26, 27. Acts v. 32.

trifling? "How forcible are right words! but "what doth your arguing prove?"[1] If indeed God, or Moses, had told us that each *letter* in the ten commandments was the representative of a *precept* in the law, we ought to have attended to it: but *asserting* that it is so, without proof, or with no proof but from "the tradition of the elders," requires no attention. The only sense, in which the ten commandments comprised the whole law, moral, ceremonial, and judicial, is this:—it virtually required every one to obey each ritual, or instituted appointment, for the time in which it continued to be in force, as a part of the general obedience to the law of God: but, if the same authority, which *instituted*, afterwards *abolished* the institution, that obligation ceased.

Let it, however, be carefully observed, that a law, in every sense as perfect as it can be, is not all which a *sinner* wants, in order to salvation or happiness. (P. 48. l. 34.) "If there had been a "law given which could have given life, verily "righteousness should have been by the law: "but the scripture hath shut up all under sin."[2] An act of parliament, however good, cannot meet the case of a criminal exposed to condemnation, or already condemned for breaking it; or supersede the necessity of a pardon from the king. Mr. C. himself observes that, in the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy, 'is pronounced the 'blessing for obedience and the curses for dis-'obedience.' Now the law cannot be sufficient

[1] Job. vi. 25.

[2] Gal. iii. 21, 22. Comp. Psalm cxxx. 3, 4. cxliii. 2.

for the happiness of him whom it 'curses for 'disobedience.' The law in itself says nothing concerning forgiveness: this must come from the mercy of the Lawgiver. "Blessed is he whose "transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered."[1] And "the circumcision of the heart," by which transgressors are brought to repent and turn to God, and to love and serve him, is the work of his special grace, according to the new covenant, by which he "writes the law in our hearts," while "our sins and iniquities he remembers no more."[2] We suppose that the ritual law, rightly understood, contained the gospel of mercy and grace, as proposed to Israel; which when Christ came, and after his crucifixion, was virtually abrogated: and plain testimonies, invitations, and promises made known the way of salvation to mankind. As 'a law of works,' the gospel itself cannot save transgressors, any more than the law of Moses can. "All have sinned, and come short of the "glory of God." Yea, every man has broken his own law; that which he, however erroneously, has proposed to himself as the law of God; and thus he is condemned by his own conscience and heart: and, if our "heart condemn us, God is "greater than our heart and knoweth all things."

We do not then say, that God has by Jesus given a new and better *law:* but that "he is the "Mediator of a better *covenant,*" than that made with Israel by the typical mediation of Moses. It is manifest that God made a covenant with Abraham, of which circumcision was the outward

[1] Ps. xxxii. 1, 2. [2] Jer. xxxi. 31—34.

seal; but of which the Aaronic priesthood and most of the ceremonies were no part: and surely the apostle's argument is conclusive, "The cove-"nant which was confirmed" (that is, with Abraham) "of God in Christ, the law, which "was four hundred and thirty years after, could "not disannul."[1] This *covenant*, so manifestly distinct from the Sinai covenant, we suppose to have comprised for substance what the prophets, and the writers of the New Testament, speak of, as "a new and everlasting covenant."

But as the new covenant, in various *circumstances*, differed from that made with Abraham; it is generally spoken of, in appropriate language, distinguishing it from the national covenant with Israel. The passage from Jeremiah, which the apostle produces and argues from, in an unanswerable manner, has been considered:[2] and the same prophet proposes the subject in similar language in a subsequent chapter. "I will give them "one heart and one way, that they may fear me "for ever, for the good of them, and of their chil-"dren after them: I will make an everlasting "covenant with them, that I will not turn away "from them to do them good; but I will put my "fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart "from me."[3] This must certainly be distinct from the Sinai covenant, in which none of these things are engaged for.—Thus Ezekiel also; "I "will remember my covenant with thee, in the "days of thy youth, and I will establish with thee

[1] Gal. iii. 16, 17. [2] Jer. 31—34. Heb. viii. 8—13. x. 15—18. [3] Jer. xxxii. 39, 40.

" an everlasting covenant. . .Then shalt thou re-
" member thy ways and be ashamed, when thou
" shalt receive thy sisters, the elder and the
" younger," (Samaria and Sodom,) " and I will
" give them unto thee, for daughters, *but not by*
" *thy covenant*."[1] " God will remember his cove-
" nant with Israel ;" " He will establish unto Israel
" an everlasting covenant :" and he will give the gentiles " to them for daughters, but not by their " covenant."—What does this mean, but that God will restore Israel, not by the national covenant, but by another distinct covenant, including the gentiles also? For substance, this was the Abrahamic covenant,[2] more explicitly proposed by the Messiah, as " the new covenant in his blood," and of which he is the Surety and Mediator.—Thus again, speaking of the restoration of Israel ; " My " servant David shall be their prince for ever ; and " I will make a covenant of peace with them ; and it " shall be an everlasting covenant with them, &c."[3] Is it not evident, that this " covenant of peace," which God will make with Israel, on their restoration, and under which " David shall be their " prince for ever," is entirely distinct from that covenant, which God made with their fathers, at Mount Sinai?

In like manner God, by Isaiah, says to the Messiah : " I will give thee for a covenant of the "people, for a light of the gentiles."[4] And again : " I will preserve thee and give thee for a covenant " of the people, to establish the earth, &c."[5] And

[1] Ez. xvi. 60, 61. [2] Ps. cv. 8—10. [3] Ez. xxxvii. 25—27.
[4] Is. xlii. 6. [5] Is. xlix. 8. See also liv. 10.

" again: Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear " and your souls shall live: and I will make an ever- " lasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies " of David." [1] Whether we understand this literally of David,[2] or figuratively of the Messiah, it must denote a covenant distinct from the national covenant of Israel; and one which is made through the Messiah with individuals, who 'obey the 'calling,' and with no others.—Again, " And the " Redeemer shall come to Zion; and unto them " that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the " Lord. As for me, this is my covenant with " them, saith the Lord, &c."—Now, this covenant made with a *remnant* of penitent Jews, at the coming of the Redeemer, (or at any other time,) could not be the same, with the national coyenant made with Israel at Mount Sinai.—In like manner, also Gabriel says to Daniel, concerning the Messiah, " He shall confirm the covenant with many " for one week." [3] Now this covenant which was confirmed " *with many*," while the rest were given up to desolations, could not be the national covenant of Sinai.—In fact, in the Old Testament, as well as the New, the covenant made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and not the Sinai covenant, is almost always referred to, whenever the promised mercies of Israel are spoken of. [4]

We therefore conclude, that the Messiah is " the " Mediator of a New and a better covenant," than that made with Israel at Mount Sinai, promising

[1] Is. lv. 3. [2] 2 Sam. xxiii. 5. Ps. lxxxix. 4, 5. [3] Dan. ix. 27.
[4] Deut. iv. 31. viii. 18. 2 Kings xiii. 23. 1 Chron. xvi. 15—18. Neh. ix. 8. Ps. cv. 9, 10. Micah vii. 20. Luke i. 54, 55, 72—75.

far more valuable blessings to those with whom it is made, and securing them in a far more irrevocable and unalterable manner: being for substance the same with the covenant made with Abraham, in behalf of himself and his Seed, even Christ, and confirmed by the oath which was sworn unto him: including also the gentiles, who are "grafted "into the good olive tree" by faith in the Messiah, and so "partake of the root and fatness of "the good olive tree."[1] But as this is proposed in a new and clearer manner, and its extent and blessings, and security, are more explicitly exhibited; it is generally called "the new covenant," as distinguished from the Sinai covenant.—I forbear to quote the New Testament on this subject; except as I introduce it to shew what our views on this subject are, and on what grounds we consider them warranted by clear testimonies from the Old Testament.—This part of the subject is wholly overlooked by Mr. C. But this *new covenant* is a far different thing from a *new law*. This I suppose St. Paul meant, when he said, "not without law "to God, but under the law to Christ." (ἔννομος Χριστῷ.)[2]

We indeed read in the New Testament of "ful-"filling the law of Christ:" but I apprehend the apostle meant, the new commandment requiring Christians to love one another for his sake, and according to the pattern of his love to them.[3] However, the constant reference of the apostles to the moral law of ten commandments, as the rule

[1] Rom. xi. 16—24. Heb. vi. 13—18. [2] 1 Cor. ix. 21.
[3] John xiii. 34. Gal. vi. 2. 1 John ii. 7, 8.

of our duty, sufficiently proves that Jesus did not intend to abolish the holy, just, good, and spiritual law of the Old Testament, to substitute one of a milder and more indulgent nature in its place.[1]

P. 49. l. 6. 'This law cannot make happy,' &c. —No law can make happy him who has *broken it*. —"Blessed are they that keep judgment, and he "that doeth righteousness at all times." "He that "doeth these things shall live in them." "The soul "that sinneth, it shall die."[2] Where is then the blessedness? "Blessed is he whose iniquity is "forgiven, and whose sin is covered." "Blessed "is the man, to whom the Lord imputeth not "iniquity." But this properly belongs not to the law but to the gospel;[3] for "without shedding of "blood there is no remission."

P. 49. l. 14. 'He ought to have,' &c.—True Christians never think of prescribing to God what he *ought* to do: it is their question, "What must "I do to be saved?" "Lord what wouldst thou "have me to do?"

P. 49. l. 17. 'In number seventy,' &c.—It is not very easy to make out the number of the distinct families which sprang from Noah's three sons; as any one will find, if he attempt to be accurate, and to distinguish exactly between their immediate and their more remote descendents. I do not think the matter deserving of a laboured investigation: but, as Mr. C. purposes to build much upon it, he ought well to secure the foun-

[1] Rom. vii. 12. xiii. 8—10. Gal. v. 14. Eph. vi. 1, 2. Jam. ii. 8—11. [2] Ps. cvi. 3. Ez. xviii. 4. xx. 11. 21. Luke x. 25—29.
[3] Ps. xxxii. 1, 2. cxxx. 4, 5. Rom. iv. 6—8.

dation; else the whole superstructure will fall to the ground on the slightest assault.

P. 49. l. 24, 25. 'Lest we be scattered, and God 'said, they shall be scattered.'—*scatter* is not a very appropriate word for such a *regular allotment*, as Mr. C. supposes was made of the earth, to these seventy families at this time.[1] Jacob said of Simeon and Levi, "I will divide them in Jacob, and "scatter them in Israel."[2] And God declared by Moses, "I said, I would scatter them into corners:" "I would make the remembrance of them to cease "from among men."[3] And Israel is now *scattered* among the nations: but could Joshua, when he divided the promised land among the tribes of Israel, be said to *scatter* them in Canaan?

P. 49. l. 26. 'The heavenly Sanhedrin,' &c. As the scripture reveals nothing of this Sanhedrin and their proceedings, I must consider the whole as a mere fable, and class it with the legends of popery; that part especially, which gives the several countries of the world to different saints, who are the special patrons of them; and who, I suppose, contend with one another, when these nations choose to engage in war; nay, with God himself, when they war against his chosen people! Thus St. James is the patron saint of Spain, St. George of England, St. Patrick of Ireland, St. Dennis of France.—The virgin Mary, I have lately heard, is now substituted in the place of the latter. We require THE WORD OF GOD, not the dreams of men. "What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the

[1] Gen. xi. 3—9. [2] Gen. xlix. 7.
[3] Lev. xxvi. 33. Deut. iv. 27. xxx. 3. xxxii. 26.

"Lord?"[1] There is not the least ground in scripture, for supposing any such regular allotment of the countries to the several families descended from Noah. The greatest part of the earth was to them *terra incognita*, an unknown country. A succession of most stupendous miracles must have occurred, even in many respects far greater than that of Israel's deliverance from Egypt and settlement in Canaan, in making known to each of these families the distant, unknown, and uncultivated country allotted to it; in prevailing on them to leave the rest of mankind, and all the cultivated parts of the world, to go in quest of this unknown land; and in conducting them, some to one region, and some to another; several of them to the most remote districts of the four continents; and also to the islands of the sea, before, as far as we know, ships were in use.—To raise such an hypothesis as this, from the two verses in the eleventh of Genesis on this subject, may prove ingenuity; but it must fall, and,

> 'Like the baseless fabric of a vision,
> 'Leave not a wreck behind.'

God was pleased to *scatter* mankind: he knew where each tribe or family would eventually settle; and he left matters to their course, according to the usual methods of his providence. This sufficed, as far as the intended inheritance of Israel was concerned:[2] and we have no further information of his purposes.

P. 50. l. 10. 'Abraham was forty-eight years

[1] Jer. xxiii, 25—29. [2] Dan. xxxii. 8.

'old'—when the earth was divided. We find in Genesis, that "unto Eber were born two sons: "the name of the one was Peleg; for in his days "was the earth divided."[1] The word *Peleg* signifies *division*. According to the chronology of the fifth and the eleventh of Genesis, Peleg was born about A. M. 1757. Terah, the father of Abraham, descended from Peleg by Reu, Serug, and Nahor, was born about A. M. 1878. Terah died at the age of 205 years, and his son Abraham was then seventy-five years old:[2] so that he was born when Terah was 130, about A. M. 2008; or 251 years after Peleg was born: but Peleg lived in all, no more than 239 years.[3] He died A. M. 1996. Abraham, according to Moses, was born A. M. 2008.—This suffices to shew, that general assertions from tradition, when compared with the scripture, are often proved to be *false*, and are always *uncertain*.—Probably Peleg's name was given him, about the time of his birth, which occurred 251 years before that of Abraham.

P. 50. l. 14. 'He cursed them,' &c. The Psalm, from which Mr. C. adduces the words of Abraham's curse, "Destroy, O Lord, and divide their "tongues," is expressly ascribed to David in the Hebrew Bible, after the manner of the other Psalms written by him.[4] It is generally allowed to have been composed during Absalom's rebellion, and to relate to Ahithophel.[5]

P. 50. l. 34. 'The lot of God,' &c. (l. 19.)—God, then, did not *choose* Abraham and his pos-

[1] Gen. x. 25. [2] Gen. xi. 32. xii. 4. [3] Gen. xi. 18, 19.
[4] Ps. lv. *Title*. [5] Ps. lv. 9—15.

terity to be his portion;[1] but the heavenly Sanhedrin settled it *by lot*. (p. 49. l. 28—32.)—But what is the lot? "The lot is cast into the "lap, but the whole disposing of it is of the Lord."[2] The heart revolts and shudders at the narration of the great dispensations of the infinite God, delivered in such language as hardly suits even the more important concerns of puny mortals.—As I cannot understand, so I do not stay to inquire, in what sense 'the lot of God was in number as 'much as that of the seventy angels.'

P. 51. l. 5. 'One good family:' 'a right to 'his oracles:' (l. 14.) '*an act of justice*.' (l. 19.) I only note these expressions that they may not escape the readers attention. At present, I desire him to recollect, if he can, any thing of similar language on the subject in the scripture; and I quote a passage or two, suited to convey other ideas of the transaction. "Speak not in thine "heart, . . .For my righteousness the Lord hath "brought me in to possess this land. Not for thy "righteousness, nor for the uprightness of thy "heart, dost thou go in to possess this land, but for "the wickedness of these nations the Lord doth "drive them out from before thee; and that he may "perform the word, which the Lord sware unto thy "fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. . .Understand, "therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not "this good land to possess it for thy righteousness, "for thou art a stiff-necked people." "Ye have been "rebellious against the Lord, from the day that I "knew you."[3] "In the day when I *chose* Israel,

[1] Deut. vii. 6, 7. Neh. ix. 7. Isa. xli. 8, 9. xliv. 1.
[2] Prov. xvi. 33. [3] Deut. ix. 4—7, 24.

"and lifted up my hand unto the seed of the "house of Jacob, and made myself known to them "in the land of Egypt, . . .I said unto them, Cast "ye away every man the abominations of his "eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of "Egypt: I am the Lord your God. But they "rebelled against me, and would not hearken unto "me; they did not cast away every man the abom-"ination of their eyes, neither did they forsake "the idols of Egypt. Then I said, I will pour out "my fury, to accomplish mine anger in the midst "of the land of Egypt. But I wrought for my "name's sake."[1]—"Ye shall remember your ways, "and all your doings, wherein ye have been "defiled; and ye shall lothe yourselves in your "own sight, for all your evils that ye have com-"mitted. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, "when I have wrought with you for my name's "sake; not according to your wicked ways, nor "according to your corrupt doings, O ye house of "Israel, saith the Lord God."[2]—The man, who claims of God what is *justly* due to him, shall have it, "without mercy." But God confers his favours on those, who allow that they do not *deserve* them.

P. 52. l. 4. 'They are called and invited by 'the word of the Lord,' &c.—Does this mean, that without circumcision, or being proselyted to the observance of the ritual law, men may share the benefits of Israel? If it does, it is a concession which I did not expect to meet with: but the words, *No law, no promise,* (p. 53. l. 18.) seem to confine it to those who are fully proselyted.

[1] Ez. xx. 5—9. [2] Ez. xx. 43, 44.

P. 52. l. 25. 'For he who will be a sharer,' &c. This hint should be carefully observed; as it seems to be in great measure overlooked in the following parts of the publication. Perhaps, however, it is exclusively meant of proselytes from the gentiles, and not of Israelites by birth.

P. 53. l. 14. 'Here is the calling,' &c.—Are then no more gentiles to share these blessings, than can dwell among the Jews in the land of promise? This, I fear, will in great measure disannul the former concession; for the land of Canaan can hold a very small part of the gentiles, that is, of the inhabitants of the globe, along with Israel.

IS THE KINGDOM OF THE MESSIAH SPIRITUAL, OR 'ABSOLUTELY EARTHLY?'

Mr. C. asserts, p. 53. l. 19. 'THE MESSIAH'S 'KINGDOM IS NOT SPIRITUAL, BUT ABSOLUTELY 'EARTHLY.' I convert his *assertion* into a question, which I purpose to discuss.

P. 53. l. 20. 'In the last chapter of Ezekiel,' &c. It would be easy to shew, that the strictly literal interpretation of Ezekiel's vision, including the last nine chapters, is attended by very great, if not absolutely insurmountable, difficulties. It is generally allowed to be one of the most obscure portions in the whole scripture; I apprehend, the most obscure of all. Various opinions have been formed respecting the times and events to which it relates: but the order in which it follows the predictions of 'the restoration of Israel,' and the slaughter of those powerful opposers, predicted under the names of Gog and Magog; its coinci-

dence, in this respect, with the New Testament predictions of the establishment of the millennium, after the terrible destruction of all opposers;[1] and, in addition to all, its very obscurity leads me to conclude, that it relates to events yet future, and subsequent to the conversion and 'restoration of 'Israel.' But I am fully persuaded that nothing, previous to its fulfilment, will enable any man to know how far it should be understood *literally*, and how far *figuratively*. The city, (which is never called *Jerusalem*,) according to the admeasurement assigned to it, would be forty miles square: and the land (which is never called *Canaan*,) of far larger dimensions, than that divided by Joshua. Exactly the same proportion is assigned to each tribe, without any difference as to numbers; and each portion is stated as extended directly across the country. I only hint these things, as obvious difficulties in the way of the strictly literal interpretation; and to shew how little certainty there can be in our reasonings from this obscure unfulfilled prophecy.

I have already observed, and desire again to point out to the reader, that 'the restoration of 'Israel' is, neither in Ezekiel, nor in any of the prophets, directly connected with the coming of the Messiah: but, if his coming is spoken of, something is constantly introduced, between the mention of it and the prophecy of Israel's restoration. Thus in Isaiah, the calling of the gentiles is introduced between the coming of the Messiah,

[1] See the author's Commentary on Ez. xxxix. xl. xlviii.—Rev. xix. xx.

and the restoration of Israel.[1] Thus in Amos, the same order is observed.[2] But in very many prophecies, the coming of the Messiah is not at all mentioned: He is supposed to have come, and to have set up his kingdom; and at length Israel receives him, or submits to him, and is restored.[3]—The prophecy of Jeremiah seems more like an exception to this statement, than any other:[4] yet the days of the restoration of Israel are marked distinctly, as subsequent to his coming. It may also be observed, that the coming of the Messiah is, in several prophecies, closely connected with judgments on the Jews, as the *immediate* consequence; which is wholly inconsistent with the restoration of the nation being the *immediate* consequence.[5]

I would however most especially observe, as connected with the present question, that 'the 'restoration of Israel' is uniformly connected with the promise of spiritual blessings: if the forgiveness of sins, and the renewal of the heart to holiness, be spiritual blessings. It will, I believe, be difficult to find any clear exception to this arrangement. Thus Moses connects that event with their confessing their sins, "their uncir- "cumcised hearts being humbled; and their "accepting the punishment of their sin."—And let it be here noted, that the Lord says, "Then "I will remember my covenant with Jacob, and "also my covenant with Isaac, and also my

[1] Is. xi. 10—16. [2] Am. ix. 11—15. [3] Ez. xxxiv. 23—31. xxxvi. 21—28. Hos. iii. 4, 5. [4] Jer. xxiii. 5—8.
[5] Dan. ix. 24—27. Zec. ix. 9, 10. xiii. 7—9. Mal. iii. 1—5.

"covenant with Abraham."[1] The Abrahamic, not the Sinai covenant is pointed out.

Again, predicting the present dispersion of Israel: "But, if from thence thou shalt seek the "Lord thy God, thou shalt find him, if thou seek "him with all thy heart and with all thy soul. "When thou art in tribulation, and all these things "are come upon thee in the latter days; if thou "turn to the Lord thy God, and shalt be obedient "to his voice, (for the Lord thy God is a merciful "God,) he will not forsake thee, nor destroy "thee; nor forget the covenant of thy fathers, "which he sware unto them."[2]—Observe again, "the covenant of thy fathers, which he *sware* "unto them."[3] The Sinai covenant was not *confirmed with an oath.*

But whence does this conduct of the dispersed Israelites arise?—Moses, speaking concerning the same events, says, "The Lord thy God will "circumcise thine heart to love the Lord thy "God, with all thy heart."[4]

It would be far too prolix to adduce the other passages, which connect the restoration of Israel with spiritual blessings; and I must only refer the reader to them.[5] And let those, who contend for an *absolutely earthly kingdom,* produce the prophecies in which this connexion cannot be traced; if indeed any such can be found. If then

[1] Lev. xxvi. 40—42. [2] Deut. iv. 29—31. [3] Gen. xxii. 16, 17. Ps. cv. 8—10. Luke i. 72—74. Heb. vi. 14—18. [4] Deut. xxx. 6. [5] Is. xi. 11—16. xii. 1—3. lix. 20, 21. Jer. xxxi. 31—36. xxxii. 39—41. Ez. xi. 17—20. xxxvi. 24—28. Hos. xiv. Mic. vii. 15—20. Zeph. iii. 13—20. Zech. xii. 10—14.

the restoration of Israel be seldom, if ever, immediately connected with the coming of the Messiah; if his coming be sometimes predicted in connexion with judgments on the Jewish nation; and if the restoration of Israel be uniformly predicted in connexion with spiritual blessings to be poured out on the nation: we shall understand what estimate we ought to make of the assertion: that "THE KINGDOM OF THE MESSIAH IS NOT SPIRITUAL, "BUT ABSOLUTELY EARTHLY:" especially as the kingdom of the Messiah and the restoration of Israel are constantly considered by the writer, as inseparably united.

P. 53. l. 32. 'One Shepherd,' &c. We Christians are apt to think, that invaluable spiritual blessings are implied in the title of SHEPHERD, as used concerning the Messiah, in several of these prophecies: and we suppose that this is grounded on many parts of the Old Testament, as well as on the New; and contains a prominent revelation of "the great mystery of godliness, God is "manifest in the flesh."—"JEHOVAH is my Shep-"herd," says David; and again, "Give ear, O "Shepherd of Israel."[1] "He shall feed his flock "like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with "his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall "gently lead those that are with young."[2] "And he "shall stand and feed in the strength of JEHOVAH, "in the majesty of the name of JEHOVAH his "God."[3] Who is here spoken of? Surely he who was to be born at Bethlehem,—"whose goings "forth have been from of old, from everlasting."

[1] Ps. xxiii. 1, 2. lxxx. 1. [2] Is. xl. 11. [3] Mic. v. 2—4.

—"Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, "against the Man that is my fellow, saith the "Lord of hosts; smite the Shepherd."[1]—When, I say, we consider these predictions in connexion, with what the New Testament says, of "the *good* "Shepherd, who layeth down his life for the "sheep:" "the *great* Shepherd of the sheep:" "the *chief* Shepherd:"[2] we consider vast, yea *all*, spiritual blessings, as involved in this name alone.

P. 55. l. 3. 'He shall execute judgment and 'justice in the earth; *but not in heaven.*' I do not see the intention of this addition to this text from Jeremiah. Our inquiry is not concerning the kingdom of the Messiah in heaven, (though he there reigns Lord of all worlds;) but concerning the nature of that kingdom which he hath set up, or will set up, on earth; whether the nature and administration of it be spiritual or 'altogether 'earthly.'—Perhaps it is meant, that he shall reign visibly on earth: and not as ascended into heaven, and ruling by his providence and the influences of his grace. This, however, suggests the propriety of stating most explicitly our views of a spiritual kingdom, as distinguished from one 'altogether earthly.'

We consider that as an *earthly* kingdom, (whether we see the king or not,) which is administered, in great measure, like the other kingdoms of this world; and which provides, or professes to provide, *only* for the temporal security and prosperity of

[1] Zech. xiii. 17.

[2] John x. 11—14. 26—30. Heb. xiii. 20. 1 Pet. v. 4.

its subjects:—It may indeed be connected with the support or establishment of religion, in one form or other; but it does not profess directly to confer spiritual blessings on those, over whom it is established. On the other hand, we consider that as a *spiritual* kingdom, which is conducted on different principles from the kingdoms of this world, and for different purposes: which does not profess to confer temporal wealth, honour, and prosperity on any of its subjects; nor always to secure them from great and heavy temporal trials, and oppressions; but immediately to confer spiritual blessings on all who truly belong to it, even "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the "Holy Ghost."[1] "*Spiritual* blessings," are those benefits which (besides their tendency to our temporal comfort,) secure the eternal happiness of our immortal souls; and also that of our bodies as raised incorruptible and glorious: but merely *earthly* blessings, at most, only conduce to our comfort and well-being during our short and uncertain continuance in this present world. To say, therefore, that the Messiah's kingdom is *spiritual*, implies that it secures (as distinct from *temporal* good,) *eternal* happiness to all the true subjects of it: but to say, that it is 'altogether 'earthly,' in our view of it, denotes that it only secures *earthly* advantages to its subjects, however loyal and faithful; and that, as to *eternal* happiness or misery, it leaves them precisely as they were. If Mr. C. or the Jews in general,

[1] Rom. xiv. 17. Eph. i. 3.

understand the terms in any other sense, when that sense is clearly stated, it may require consideration.

Our view of the Messiah's kingdom, as *spiritual*, does not exclude many temporal advantages ensured to its genuine subjects: for, whatever prepares the soul for holy happiness in another world, adds to our true comfort in this life; and to those, who "seek first the kingdom of God "and his righteousness," "all other things shall "be added." "The Lord will give grace and "glory; and no good thing will he withhold from "them that walk uprightly."[1] But we exclude from the catalogue of these blessings whatever tends to gratify, and give energy to man's corrupt passions; such as rapacity for wealth, ambition of preëminence, lust of dominion, thirst after revenge, desire of the pleasures, pomp, and pride of life; and indeed the craving after any animal indulgence, beyond the rule of duty, expediency, and love to all men. And we give an immense preëminence to those blessings, which will be enjoyed *for ever*, above the most rational and legitimate comforts of this present state.—To be made partakers of heavenly wisdom and knowledge; to have "the heart circumcised" by the regeneration of the Holy Spirit; to be pardoned, and justified by faith, with believing Abraham; to be renewed unto holiness; to have God for our Father, Friend, and Portion; our Guide unto death; "and," at that crisis, "to receive us to glory:" to walk with him in assured faith and hope; to worship him in

[1] Ps. lxxxiv. 11. Matt. vi. 33.

" the Spirit of adoption;" to enjoy the earnests and foretastes of eternal happiness; to be delivered from the fear of death, and at length from death itself, when " mortality shall be swallowed up of " life:" these are some of the spiritual blessings of our Messiah's kingdom.

On the other hand, 'a kingdom altogether 'earthly' would supply or ensure none of these things; neither heavenly wisdom and knowledge, nor renewal unto holiness, nor " justification unto " life," nor " reconciliation unto God," nor adoption into his family, nor the meetness for a holy heaven, nor admission into it, nor " the resurrec- " tion of the just." If these things belong exclusively to a *spiritual* kingdom, it would be waste of time, to bring a formal proof that the Messiah's kingdom at least includes spiritual blessings to its true subjects. But, if such blessings be included in Mr. C.'s notion of a *kingdom* 'absolutely 'earthly;' he only uses words in a different sense than we do, or than men in general do; and " a " strife of words" is not edifying.

I suspect, however, that the question, whether these things are included among the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom, or not, was out of sight when he wrote the passage: for, while temporal advantages appear far the most prominent in his mind, in every part of his book, he occasionally gives intimations of some things, that are certainly *spiritual* blessings, which will be conferred by the Messiah.

According to the expectations of the Jews in the time of Jesus, and even the expectations of his apostles before his resurrection, it is evident

that a Messiah, coming like the conquerors of this world, but far superior in power to all of them; to free the nation of Israel from subjection to the Romans, and from all foreign vassalage; to lead them forth to victory and triumph; to subjugate other nations, and to advance Israel to prëeminence, prosperity, and dominion; constituted the object of their desires and hopes. It is also evident that this was, in most instances, connected with the thirst for a contemptuous and insulting revenge upon their oppressors, and for exercising a haughty and severe domination over mankind at large: and, as far as I can judge from the specimen before me, it appears that the expectation and desire of modern Jews are nearly the same. If this be not the case, let them explicitly declare what they do expect and desire at the supposed coming of their Messiah.

It is now becoming more and more the opinion of studious Christians, that, when Israel shall be converted to their long rejected Messiah, they will be gathered from their dispersions, and reinstated in their own land; which, being rendered as fertile as in times past, (perhaps much more so,) and extended to the utmost limits of the grants made to the patriarchs, will yield them, in rich abundance, all things needful and comfortable for this present life. It is also thought that they will live in this land, under rulers of their own nation, as the vicegerents of the Messiah, of David, or "the Son of David," in entire peace and security, free from invader or oppressor, and from the fear of any: and that, along with all spiritual blessings in rich abundance, they will be

voluntarily regarded by all other nations, then truly converted to Christianity, with peculiar love, and gratitude, and honour, as the source of all their spiritual blessings; and especially, as most nearly related to their common Messiah and Saviour, who is "the Light of the gentiles, and "the GLORY of his people Israel."

It is indeed supposed, according to several prophecies, that great opposition will be made by many powerful enemies to this their restoration; and that an immense destruction of opposing gentiles will precede and attend it, while other gentiles will concur in promoting it: but that, this being accomplished, a general conversion of the nations will follow; till those prophecies, which assure us "that the earth shall be filled "with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, "as the waters cover the sea," shall be literally accomplished: that then, "they will beat their "swords into plough-shares, and learn war no "more;" and that this state will continue at least a thousand years, and nearly to the end of the world. During this whole period, an honorary and affectionate preëminence will be freely rendered to Israel, by all the numberless partakers of the blessings of their Messiah's reign.

But it is not supposed that Israel will either *possess* or *desire* authoritative dominion over the nations; or any thing to gratify the corrupt passions before spoken of; but every thing to promote "righteousness, and peace, and joy in "the Holy Ghost." The *personal* reign of Christ on earth; the existence, or non-existence, of the ceremonial law of Moses; and several other

things, are differently held by different persons: and it is not needful for the author to be very explicit here concerning his own sentiments on these points. But the above is the outline of his views, after the constant study of the scriptures, day by day, during at least thirty-eight years.

Every promise of the Messiah, from that made to our fallen first parents, which contains, as it were in embryo, all the blessings of redemption and deliverance from sin and all its consequences; from Satan and his dominion, with victory and triumph over all enemies; and those to Abraham, and throughout the scripture; to the last prediction of the Old Testament, "Unto you that "fear my name, shall the Sun of righteousness "arise with healing in his beams;"[1] combines in shewing that *spiritual* blessings, primarily and especially, constitute the felicity of Messiah's reign: and I shall not weary the reader by enlarging in so plain a case.

In fact, I should feel an increasing disregard to the result of the controversy, if I could doubt that the blessings of Messiah's kingdom were *spiritual* and *eternal*. Were I a Jew, or a Jewish proselyte; and were 'an absolutely earthly kingdom,' in all possible glory and majesty established, under an earthly Messiah; and did I occupy the highest station in this kingdom: what, at my time of life, and with the full conviction that "shortly I must "put off this my tabernacle;" what good, I say, could such a station secure to me? But, if I am a partaker of those spiritual and eternal blessings,

[1] Gen. iii. 15. Mal. iv. 2.

which "are the gift of God through Jesus Christ," I have "all my salvation and all my desire;" and may say with Simeon, "Now, Lord, dismissest "thou thy servant in peace; for mine eyes have "seen thy salvation:" or, with dying Jacob, "I "have waited for thy salvation, O Lord."[1] And here, I cannot but lament that Mr. C., throughout his book, does not appear to be possessed with any deeply realizing and influential views of an eternal world of happiness or misery. It is not easy to discover, with exactness, what his sentiments are on these topics. There are indeed, occasionally, some intimations on this immensely momentous subject; yet in general he writes very much as if this world were our all. Probably he has the same sentiments of the superior advantages of Jews above gentiles, as to eternal salvation, which his ancestors had in the days of Christ: but they are not prominently stated, or particularly insisted on, as the *grand concern;* and not at all, in any connexion with the coming and kingdom of the Messiah. If I understand him, salvation is to be to the Jews by the law of Moses; and in no respect by the Messiah.

Now, as I most firmly believe that, after this vain, transient, and uncertain life, a state of endless happiness or misery will follow: and that, as all are sinners, no man can be saved from final misery, and obtain eternal happiness, but by the mercy and grace of God, in the way of his appointment,—which, I am assured is, by faith in the Messiah, promised from the fall of Adam:

[1] Gen xlix. 18.

and as all else seems *nothing* to me in comparison of this; I stand amazed that a man can think it worth while to dispute about an 'absolutely 'earthly kingdom;' which, by his own account, will not commence till he is either very far advanced in years, or has entered into the eternal world; and so can have no further concern with any of those things which "are done under the "sun!" or in the words, which he marks in Italics, '*under the whole heaven.*'

All the past generations of Israel, according to this, have left the earth, without the least advantage from this 'absolutely earthly kingdom of 'the Messiah:' at any rate most of the present race will leave the earth before the earliest period *now* specified for his coming shall arrive: and, alas! if there were any well grounded hope of its arrival, still only a few of the whole race could partake of the more splendid advantages expected; and that only for a short space. Still "vanity "and vexation" would be the inventory of earthly good; still man must "eat his bread in labour "and sorrow, till he return to the ground whence "he is taken."—Are we then to consider this writer's views as a specimen of Judaism?—At any rate it excites my deepest commiseration.

I shall close this part by asking, whether the texts adduced, concerning the Messiah's kingdom, on the fifty-fourth page, contain no predictions or promises of spiritual blessings?

P. 55. l. 12. In adducing the prophecy of Daniel, "The kingdom and dominion—shall be "given to the people of the saints of the most "High," Mr. C. quotes it, "To the holy nation

"of the most High."[1] I am not fully competent to say how far the Chaldee will bear this translation: but I thought it right to note the variation. Our version seems to be literal.

P. 55. l. 19. 'Proof from the gospel,' &c. From these quotations, it is probable that the *place* where the Messiah reigns, or shall reign, is principally intended by Mr. C. when he affirms, the Messiah's kingdom to be 'absolutely earthly:' as he has added after the quotation from Jeremiah, '"He shall execute judgment and justice in the "earth,"[2] *but not in heaven.*'

P. 55. l. 27. 'A throne for the Messiah,' &c. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the "sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre," &c. Will any throne 'in this world' be "for ever and "ever?"[3] It appears evidently, that the dominion mentioned by Daniel, as given to the Son of man, is established in heaven, and not on earth.[4] This, however, is a subject, on which I shall not at present enter: many, who hold with me the general views of the Messiah's kingdom, expect a personal and visible reign of Christ on earth, during the millennium. (l. 33.)—"Eating and "drinking;" are terms often used *figuratively*, as in the place referred to: but in the Messiah's kingdom, as far as this world is concerned, men literally eat and drink, as well as in other kingdoms, though in a more holy manner. It is surprising that a proof *from the New Testament*, of Christ's judging Israel only, should be brought; and that

[1] Dan. vii. 27.
[2] Jer. xxiii. 5, 6.
[3] Ps. xlv. 6.
[4] Dan. vii. 9—14.

judging Israel should be considered as synonymous to "reigning over Israel;" when the judgment spoken of must most evidently be judging in order to the condemnation of the nation in general. The same is the import of the promise to the apostles, that they shall "judge the twelve tribes "of Israel."[1] When Mr. C. asserts, (p. 56. l. 2.) that the Messiah will be king 'over Israel only,' he fixes a meaning on the words which is totally inconsistent with the whole of the New Testament: indeed it does not clearly appear in what sense he himself understands them; for I suppose he will allow that the Messiah shall rule the nations, though it be only to punish and destroy them.

P. 56. l. 3. 'Law of an ambassador,' l. 6. 'This ambassador,' &c. If the ambassador be commissioned and instructed to go to the *government* of the country to which he is sent, he certainly ought to do it: but it is not the uniform practice of kings to send ambassadors to the governors of a country; especially when those governors are *usurpers*, *rebels*, and *traitors* to their prince, and *tyrants* over his loyal subjects. In these cases, they sometimes send ambassadors to inferior persons, who loyally adhere to their lawful king. Indeed it is by no means uncommon for princes to send ambassadors to those, who, in any country, resist the authority of the ruling powers, according as political purposes may be answered by it. But were it otherwise, surely the

[1] 1 Sam. ii. 25. Ezek. xx. 4. xxii. 2. xxiii. 24, 36, 45. xxiv. 14. Obad. 21. 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.

infinite God is not bound by the rules and customs of puny mortals. "My thoughts are not "your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, "saith the Lord: for as the heavens are higher "than the earth; so are my ways higher than your "ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."[1] Even Moses was sent to the enslaved Israelites to deliver them, and not as an ambassador to *treat with* Pharaoh about their deliverance. The prophets in general were sent to the people, as well as to the princes: and, when sent to the princes, it was *never to treat with them*, as the ambassadors of one king with another king, (thus placing the sovereign of the world on a level with his creatures;) but as reprovers of their crimes in the name of JEHOVAH, or as encouraging their confidence in him. What does Mr. C. think of Jeremiah's conduct, who even counselled the people to desert Zedekiah and the princes, and to submit to the Chaldeans?[2] Did he observe 'the law of 'an ambassador?' It is awfully presumptuous, in this manner to dictate and prescribe to God what his conduct ought to be. "Who hath di-"rected the Spirit of the Lord, or being his coun-"sellor hath taught him? With whom took he "counsel, and who instructed him, and taught "him the path of judgment, and taught him "knowledge, and shewed him the way of under-"standing?"[3]—It is 'the law of an ambassador,' at all times and in all cases, to obey the commands, and adhere to the instructions, of him *who sent him;* and not to deviate a hair's breadth, in order

[1] Is. lv. 8, 9. [2] Jer. xxvii. 12—17. xxxviii. 1—3. [3] Is. xl. 13, 14.

to oblige or conciliate those to whom he is sent. If either inclination, or fear, or hope, induce him to act contrary, in any respect, to the instructions given him, he betrays his trust, and is liable to be disowned and punished by his principal.—Thus Jesus says, " I came down from heaven, not to do " mine own will, but the will of him that sent me:"[1] and he continually speaks to the same effect. His apostles also declare that, " if they were men-" pleasers, they could not be the servants of " Jesus Christ." If an ambassador be sent to one people, to make proposals; and be ordered, in case they will not accede to them, to go to another people; (which is not uncommon;) he fulfils the 'law of an ambassador,' by acting according to these instructions.

P. 56. l. 32. 'Burst out a laughing,' &c. The reader will judge how far this language suits the nature and importance of the subject. It however approaches more nearly to the actual conduct of the Jews, in our Lord's days, than perhaps even Mr. C. was aware.[2]

P. 57. l. 5. 'Punished with a just punishment.' —Thus the Jews, " crucify to themselves the Son " of God afresh, &c." Therefore the old imprecation of their ancestors remains in force, " His blood " be on us and on our children."[3] Oh, may " the Spirit of grace and supplication be speedily " poured out upon them," that they may " look " on him whom they have pierced," with godly sorrow and penitent faith; and thus have the

[1] John vi. 38. [2] Luke vi. 25. xvi. 14. Jam. iv. 9.
[3] Matt. xxvii. 25. Heb. vi. 6.

curse exchanged for a blessing, and for al
sings! Let all Christians pray for this wi
ceasing.

P. 57. l. 7. 'This was the case with the G
'Messiah. He was sent,' &c.—Our Lord's per
ministry was principally among the Jews: bu
commission which he gave to his apostles sh
that he considered himself as the Saviour
King of all nations.[1] Let it, however, be obser
that he said, "I am sent to the *lost sheep* of
"house of Israel:" but he never said, 'I am
'to the nation of Israel:' much less was he
to his corrupt and wicked shepherds. His p
fession therefore was consistent with his condu
and it was *his duty* to adhere to his commissi
or, "the will of his Father who sent him."

P. 57. l. 10. 'To go to king Herod,' &c.—*K*
Herod died when Jesus was an infant:[3] but, h
he been living, would it have been proper th
Jesus, when about to enter on his ministry, shoul
go to that cruel tyrant, who had before attempte
to murder him?—Herod, the tetrarch of Galilee,
(who probably is meant,) had no authority in
Judea, or connexion with the Sanhedrin. Pontius
Pilate was governor of Judea. Ought Jesus then
to have gone to this idolatrous governor, as well
as to Annas and Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin?

P. 57. l. 13. 'He never went to Jerusalem,' &c.
—It would be well if men, before they publish
their remarks on any book, or attempt to refute it,
would carefully read the whole of it. Our Lord

[1] Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Mark xvi. 15, 16. Luke xxiv. 47, 48. Acts i. 8.

[3] Matt. ii. 19, 20.

to Jerusalem soon after he entered on his work; and when he had hitherto, as far as n learn, wrought only one miracle.[1] Nothing be more public than his conduct on this oc- n; in driving the buyers and sellers from the ts of the temple; nothing more suited to make claim known to the rulers and priests; nothing e efficacious could be even imagined, to excite n to investigate that claim. Accordingly he interrogated concerning it; and the Jews id unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, t thou doest these things?"[2] To this demand ave an answer, exactly coinciding with what spake on another occasion; making his resur- tion from the dead, after they had slain him, SIGN, above all others, of his authority to do e things. The language in which this answer given, implying a decisive intimation of his ne dignity and power, being misunderstood, misreported, yet remembered long afterwards, ned one of the accusations against him before aphas and the Sanhedrin.[3] Thus the prophecy Malachi was fulfilled, "The Lord, whom ye ek, shall suddenly come to his temple; even he Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight : behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of osts, but who may abide the day of his oming?"[4]

At this time, he wrought such miracles that odemus, one of the Sanhedrin, acknowledged his own name, and in the name of other rulers

[1] John ii. 11—13. [2] John ii. 14—18. [3] John ii. 19—22.
[4] Mat. xxvi. 61, 62. [4] Mal. iii. 1, 2.

and Pharisees, "We know that thou art a teacher "come from God; for no man can do these "miracles which thou doest, except God be with "him."[1] Indeed the miracles wrought by him at Jerusalem procured him a favourable reception even in Galilee.[2]

This preceded the imprisonment of John the Baptist.—It was also in an early part of our Lord's ministry, that he healed the man at the pool of Bethesda, and ordered him to carry his bed on the Sabbath. On account of this he was persecuted evidently before the Sanhedrin; and made that defence, which contains as high claims of Deity and universal dominion, as can be conceived; and at the same time stated before his judges, the evidences by which those claims were supported, in the most explicit, and as the event shewed, most unanswerable manner.[3]

'He never went to Jerusalem!' Such an *assertion* should render the reader cautious how he credits other unproved *assertions* of the writer.

P. 57. l. 14. 'And why? Because he had heard,' &c: (l. 23, 24.) 'He was afraid to go to Jerusalem,' &c.—Our Lord certainly went to Jerusalem, both before and after John's imprisonment; and taught boldly at the temple without fear of any man, or body of men. But why should John Baptist's imprisonment by Herod make Jesus afraid of going to Jerusalem? What authority had Herod in Jerusalem? He was tetrarch of Galilee,[4] while Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea. Had a

[1] John iii. 1, 2. [2] John iv. 45. [3] John v. 16—47.
[4] Luke iii. 1, 19, 20. xxiii. 6, 7.

motive of this kind acquired any influence on our Lord, he would have declined going into *Galilee*, lest Herod should imprison and kill him also: and indeed his insidious enemies did afterwards urge this reason why he should leave Galilee. [1]

Jesus had preached and wrought miracles, in Judea, in Galilee, and at Jerusalem, for a considerable time before John was imprisoned: and his usual abode seems to have been at Nazareth. —"But, when he had heard that John was cast "into prison, he departed" (probably from Judea) "into Galilee; and leaving Nazareth, he came "and dwelt at Capernaum." [2] So far from fearing the power which had shut up John in prison, he went to reside in the heart of Herod's dominions; and his more stated labours were from that time in Galilee.

P. 57, 58.—The quotations on these pages are made with the omission of many verses, on which the meaning greatly depends; but nothing requires special notice.

P. 58. l. 24. 'What sign,' &c: (p. 59. l. 10.) 'Not once gave them a sign,' &c. Our Lord paid no more court to the *many* than to the *powerful*; and would no more work a needless ostentatious miracle, to satisfy the presumptuous multitude, who were disposed to "take him by force and "make him king;" than at the demand of those enemies, who determined to "take him by force, "and put him to death."

P. 59. l. 16. 'Was his commission,' &c?—

[1] Luke xiii. 31—35.

[2] Matt. iv. 12—18. Mark i. 14. John iii. 22—24. iv. 3.

Jesus "came into the world to save sinners." "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to "repentance." He came to be the Saviour of the "world;" the Prophet, Priest, and King of his church; the Ruler over the whole universe; and the Judge of the living and the dead. But his personal ministry consisted principally in teaching, and in confirming his doctrine by miracles of mercy and love. "He went about doing good."

P. 59. l. 21. 'If this is true,' &c.—Let the reader make his own remarks on the language of this sentence. It could hardly have been expected from a Rabbi, or from a teacher of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. The end of our Lord's coming, both as stated by Gabriel and Zacharias, takes in the *whole effect of his mission*, from his birth to the end of the world; and not merely his personal ministry.

P. 60. l. 1. 'His people,' &c.—Not to adduce the New Testament use of this expression, before the conclusion drawn from it is established, some passages in the prophets should be noticed.—"Whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, "blessed be Egypt, *my people*, and Assyria the "work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance."[1] "In the place, where it was said to them, Ye are "not my people, there it shall be said unto them, "Ye are the sons of the living God."—"And I "will say to them, which were not my people, "Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou "art my God."[2] "And many nations shall be "joined unto the Lord in that day, and shall be

[1] Isa. xix. 25. [2] Hos. i. 10. ii. 23.

"*my people.*"[1] "His people," therefore, includes, all who truly believe and obey him, whether Jews or gentiles, and none else. "He became the "Author of eternal salvation unto all them that "obey him."[2]

P. 60. l. 3. 'Not a preacher.' The predictions that the Messiah should be a king, by no means prove, that he would not be a preacher. Moses was "king in Jeshurun:"[3] Yet he says, "Be- "hold I have taught you statutes and judgments, "even as the Lord my God hath commanded "me."[4]—"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; "because the Lord hath anointed me to *preach* "good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me "to bind up the broken hearted; to proclaim "liberty to the captives, and the opening of the "prison to them that are bound." Is this a prophecy of the Messiah, or not? If not, whom does the prophet personate?[5] Again, either David, or the Messiah says, "I have preached "righteousness in the great congregation. Lo, "I have not refrained my lips, and that thou "knowest. I have not hid thy righteousness within "my heart; I have declared thy faithfulness and "thy salvation: I have not concealed thy loving "kindness and truth from the great congrega- "tion."[6] And again, "My mouth shall shew "forth thy righteousness and thy salvation all the "day." "Hitherto have I declared thy wondrous "works. Now, also, when I am old and grey-

[1] Zech. ii. 11. [2] Heb. v. 9. [3] Deut. xxxiii. 5.
[4] Deut. iv. 5. [5] Is. lxi. 1—3. Luke iv. 17—21.
[6] Ps. xl. 9, 10.

"headed, O God, forsake me not; until I have "shewed thy strength to this generation, and thy "power to every one that is yet to come."[1] Even Solomon appears perhaps more glorious as a preacher, than as a king. "The words of the "PREACHER, the son of David, the king of Je- "rusalem." "I the PREACHER was king over "Israel in Jerusalem."[2] In this especially Solomon was a type of Christ: but "behold a greater "than Solomon is here."

P. 60. l. 34. 'To fight,' &c.—No doubt, the Messiah will fight against the enemies of Israel: but probably Zechariah, or the Holy Spirit as speaking by him, intended enemies of another kind, from whom the Saviour delivers all true believers as his people. And let it be observed, that the Sinai covenant is not referred to; but that which was confirmed to Abraham by an oath.

P. 61. l. 21. 'Conclusion of his embassy.' P. 62. l. 8. 'Well might,' &c.—That worldly and ungodly men should oppose and revile the holy Jesus, cannot be wonderful: but that any one should consider their revilings as a proof that he was a bad man, without any other evidence adduced, is most unreasonable and most marvellous. He was indeed taken, and judged, and put to death; but his embassy did not conclude with his death. For he arose, and ascended, and reigns over all worlds, while the desolations of Jerusalem and the temple, the dreadful judgments which overtook his crucifiers; and the subsequent establishment of Christianity in the world, with

[1] Ps. lxxi. 15, 17, 18. [2] Eccl. i. 1, 12. xii. 8—10.

all the past, present, and future happy consequences, resulting from it, are sequels of his embassy; which will be concluded, when he shall come to judge the world, to "put all enemies "under his feet," and cause his friends to sit down with him upon his throne: but not till that final catastrophe.

P. 62. l. 14. 'The Messiah was to be a con-'queror.—He will subdue,' &c.—The Messiah will eventually subdue all nations; but not immediately at his coming. "The stone cut out of "the mountain without hands," does not at once "become a great mountain, and fill the whole "earth."—"Of the increase of his government "and peace, there shall be no end."[1] It is no where said, that this should occur *at his coming*. With what weapons, and in what manner, the Messiah fights and conquers, may give occasion to discordancy of sentiment: but we all agree that he fights, and conquers, and will conquer, and "must reign till all enemies are put under "his feet."[2] Vast multitudes have been and will be conquered by those "weapons which are not "carnal but mighty through God," and will become his willing subjects.[3] Others he has fought against, and will fight against, by his hostile armies; as he did against Jerusalem by "his armies" the Romans;[4] and as he will against all antichristian opposers of his cause, at the introduction of the millennium.[5] Among

[1] Dan. ii. 34, 35, 44, 45. Is. ix. 5, 6.
[2] Ps. cx. 1. 1 Cor. xv. 25. [3] Ps. cx. 2, 3. 2 Cor. x. 4, 5.
[4] Zech. xiv. 1, 2. Matt. xxii. 7. [5] Ezek. xxxviii. Rev. xix. 11—21.

others, he will fight against the adversaries of converted Israel, when the time of their restoration shall come. "And the breath of his lips "shall slay the wicked" at the day of judgment.

The prophecies produced, (p. 62, 63.) prove nothing in this argument; because when compared with the context of each, they evidently appear to refer to different parts of the same general subject.

The first promise of a Messiah, "Her Seed" (that of the woman) "shall bruise thy head," (the head of the serpent, the devil,) leads us to consider other victories of the Messiah, and over very different enemies, than those mentioned by Mr. C., as of by far the greatest importance in this holy warfare. Satan, sin, the world, and death are especially those enemies, which Zacharias meant, when he said; "that, being delivered out of the "hand of our enemies, we might serve him "without fear, in holiness and righteousness "before him all the days of our life."[1] Thus it is said in Micah, "He will turn again, he will "have compassion upon us: he will *subdue* our "iniquities:" and by Ezekiel, "I will also save "you from all your uncleannesses."[2] These are enemies and victories which Mr. C. seems not to have a thought of.

It is indeed frequently predicted that the Messiah will terribly destroy his enemies, and graciously protect his people: but it is by no means so prominent in prophecy, that he will exalt his people to dominion over the rest of the

[1] Luke i. 71—75. [2] Ezek. xxxvi. 29. Mic. vii. 19.

world. In the millennium "the kingdom and "dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom "under the whole heaven, shall be given to the "people of the *saints* of the most High."[1] In and with their King, they shall have the prëeminence. But where is the prediction, that Israel as a nation shall have dominion over other nations? Little is spoken upon this part of the subject. Even the result of their restoration is generally represented as their dwelling in peace and security, and none making them afraid.[2]

P. 64. l. 27. 'A particular observation,' &c. 'Every man knows that whatever has a be-'ginning has also an end.'—According to this, there are no *created* immortal spirits, either angels or men. If Mr. C. did not mean (as I should not suppose he did,) to deny the immortality of the human soul, and of holy angels, here is an exception to his universal rule. Plato seems to have held a similar opinion; for he grounds many of his arguments for the soul's continuing to live after the death of the body, on the supposition that it had a previous existence, to which he assigns no beginning.

P. 65. l. 11. 'A drawing,' &c.—That "known "unto God are all his works from the beginning "of the world," yea from eternity; that he formed, so to speak, a plan of his grand designs in his own infinite mind; that he revealed, in the way of prophecy, some particulars of this plan; and that he invariably and without any change of purpose,

[1] Dan. vii. 14, 27. [2] Jer. xxiii. 5—7. xxxii. 37. xxxiii. 16. Ezek. xxxiv. 25—28. Amos ix. 14, 15.

is accomplishing his great object, through successive generations; I firmly believe. But, when 'the *drawing*' of this plan is said to be contained in 'the law of Moses,' (p. 65. l. 26.) further proof is needful. The tabernacle, and all connected with it, was made "after the pattern, which was "shewed Moses in the mount;"[1] for they were intended, as "a shadow of good things to come." And in like manner David had "the pattern of "all—by the Spirit," respecting Solomon's temple. "The Lord made me to understand in writing, "by his hand upon me, even all the works of the "pattern."[2] Moses also seems to have had something of a drawing, or delineation, shewn him of the promised land:[3] but where do we meet with any intimation, that God gave him 'a 'drawing' of all the particulars here mentioned? or indeed how was it possible? Can mortal man receive and comprehend all the plans and designs of the infinite God? Some intimation is given concerning a few of the particulars in this catalogue; but very little: and, in most cases, that little is intimated with considerable and intended obscurity.—'In this drawing is also to be found, 'how long this world shall exist.' (p. 65. l. 25.) I ask, Where? Conjectures have been made, some of them sufficiently presumptuous; and conclusions drawn from inadequate premises: but I believe, that neither man nor angel knows the exact time when the world shall come to an end.[4] —As Mr. C. means to build a great deal indeed

[1] Exod. xxv. 40.
[2] 1 Chr. xxviii. 11, 19.
[3] Num. xxxiv.
[4] Matt. xxiv. 36.

on this 'drawing' something more than assertion is requisite, in laying and strengthening his foundation. The *subdrawings* (p. 65. l. 27.) of the prophets contain some further intimations; but very far from what is here ascribed to them: they only contain detached extracts, so to speak, out of the volume of God's secret decrees.

P. 65. l. 34. 'Abridgment of the law and of the 'prophets.'—P. 66. l. 8. 'Six is a complete 'number.'—Some think *seven* is a complete number: and it must be allowed that the number *seven* is so often, and so emphatically, specified in scripture, as to imply something peculiar in it: I suppose this may be taken from the six days of creation, and the seventh of rest. Yet nothing, in a way of argument, can thence be deduced.

P. 66. l. 20. 'His name was called Adam,' &c. —The name *Adam*, as every smatterer in Hebrew knows, is the name of the human species, as well as of the first man; and seems to have been taken merely from אֲדָמָה, the material from which his body was formed.[1] The scripture indeed assigns special significations to several names, and the reasons for which they were given; as Eve, Abraham, Ishmael, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Israel, &c:[2] but not a hint is given, that there was any mystery in the name Adam: all advanced therefore on this ground is mere assertion or imagination.

P. 66. l. 28. 'So long, or near it,' &c.—The words, 'or near it,' are very conveniently introduced: for Mr. C.'s *computation* must be made

[1] Gen. ii. 7. v. 2. [2] Gen. iii. 20. xvi. 11. xvii. 5, 15, 19. xxi. 3—6. xxv. 26. xxvii. 36. xxxii. 28. Exod. ii. 10.

to fit his *hypothesis*. This resembles the bed of Procrustes, who seized on travellers and measured them by his bed: if they were too long he cut them shorter, but if too short be stretched them longer.

P. 66. l. 26. 'In the year of the creation,' &c. According to the most approved chronologists, the computation being made from the Hebrew Bible, David was born A. M. 2919; and the present is computed to be about A. M. 5818. Exactness is not the object. The Septuagint makes it much more, but I believe few well-informed persons make it much less. Yet this entirely subverts the whole of Mr. C.'s hypothesis: for 2919 years to David's birth, require 2919 subsequent to it, before the coming of the Messiah; which would lead us to A. M. 5838, instead of A. M. 5708, and so prolong the term of his expected coming 130 years longer, than Mr. C. calculates.—But perhaps our chronology may answer his purpose as well, when fairly considered; for, according to our computation, the present year is A. M. 5819: and this leaves only 19 years to A. M. 5838, when the date of David's birth will be doubled. This would be more convenient for his scheme than 137 years yet to come: it would also save him the trouble of *shortening the term*; and be more consistent with his calculations in another place. (p. 88.)

P. 67. l. 12. 'The end of any thing may be 'shortened.'—It seems it may also be *lengthened*: for, from the time of Jesus, false Messiahs have appeared, almost in every century; and have for a while been welcomed by many of the Jews, and

then disappeared. Thus every disappointment has reduced them to the necessity of *lengthening* the termination of the intervening period, one hundred years after another, to the present day: and, when the present dream has proved a delusion, (as it most assuredly will,) some other will be dreamed, to find a pretence for still lengthening the period; till "the Spirit of grace and supplica-"tions" be poured out, and they "shall look" with penitent faith "on him whom they have "pierced," and crucified to themselves afresh," from age to age.[1]

But there is no grappling with a phantom, or grasping smoke: like the shade of Anchises, it eludes the hand of him who would seize on it, *Par levibus ventis, volucrique simillima somno.* A serious argumentative answer cannot be expected, and the subject is too momentous for any other. The passage may, however, remind the reader of the prophet's words: "They hatch cockatrice eggs, "and weave the spider's web:"—"their webs shall "not become garments."[2]

P. 67. l. 14. 'We know that Christ was born '910 years after David.'—'The Jews have a tra-'dition, that in the last year of Darius (Hystaspes) 'died the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. 'And from the same tradition they tell us, that 'the kingdom of the Persians ceased also the same 'year. For they will have it, that this was the 'Darius whom Alexander conquered, and that the 'whole continuance of the Persian empire was only 'fifty-two years. This shews how ill they were

[1] Zech. xii. 10—14

[2] Is. lix. 4—6.

'acquainted with the affairs of the Persian empire. 'And their countryman Josephus, in the account 'which he gives us of those times, seems to have 'been very little better informed concerning 'them.' *(Prideaux.)* They confound Darius Hystaspes with Darius Codomannus; though Xerxes, Artaxerxes Longimanus, Darius Nothus, and Artaxerxes Mnemon reigned between them. The Persian empire, from the accession of Darius the Mede, to the death of Darius Codomannus, continued for about 207 years. This occasions the great difference in chronology between Jewish and Christian writers, as to the times between the captivity and the coming of our Lord. But Mr. C. varies even from this, and is repeatedly inconsistent with himself. It is generally computed that David died 1015 years before Christ, and consequently was born 1085 before him; but this is of little consequence.

P. 67. l. 30. 'The placing of Adam in the 'garden of Eden.' As far as this passage agrees with the narrative of Moses, it is entitled to firm credence: (p. 67, 68:) but it is 'intermixed with 'a few traditions' (p. 69. l. 3.) I do not indeed believe these traditions, yet they are not of sufficient importance to require any remarks. But the familiar, colloquial manner, in which the events recorded in the word of God, and inseparably connected with the present and eternal interests of the human species, are mentioned, cannot satisfy any serious mind, Christian, Jewish, or gentile.

P. 67. l. 33. 'No angel could,' &c. This the scripture does not say.—'And God taught Adam

'the names even all of them. Then he proposed 'them to the angels, and said, Declare unto 'me the names of these things, if ye be true. 'They answered: Praise is thine; we have not 'knowledge, except as much as thou hast taught 'us. Truly thou art knowing and wise. And 'God said, O Adam, Declare to them the names 'of these things. And, when he had declared to 'them their names; he (God) said, Did not I say 'to you that I know the secret of the heavens and 'the earth; and I know what ye do openly and 'what ye conceal? And, when we said to the 'angels, Adore Adam; they even adored: but 'Eblis (the devil) refused, and was lifted up in 'pride.' 'And Satan caused them to fall from 'paradise, and we said, Go down, the one an 'enemy to the other.' (*Koran, 2d chap.*) Probably Mohammed derived his information from Jewish tradition; and he has added absurdity to it: but the coincidence is remarkable.

P. 68. l. 33. 'Overcame Satan.' It is well that Satan, the grand enemy of all, is at all mentioned as to be overcome by man: but is this victory to be obtained by the power of Adam, or any of his fallen and sinful posterity? or by that of "the "Seed of the woman, who shall bruise the ser-"pent's head?" "The second Adam is the Lord "from heaven."

P. 69. l. 9. 'THE LAW OF NOAH.' It may be proper here to make a few remarks on this supposed law of Noah: because many writers, Christians as well as Jews, have mentioned it, as an *existing rule of duty*: but where it is to be found *in scripture* they do not state. In fact, it belongs

to *tradition*: and, like the traditions of men in general, it "makes void the law of God," and at the same time disannuls the gospel. The law of God commands "us to love him with all the "heart," and "all men as ourselves." And the gospel calls transgressors to repentance, conversion, faith in the mercy of God, through the promised Redeemer, and obedience to the divine law, as the fruit of this faith. But what do these precepts of Noah require, in order to acceptance and future happiness? Provided idolatry, blasphemy, (a crime not easily defined with precision,) incest, (another ambiguous term, diversely explained,) murder, robbery, and theft, and eating the member of a living creature, be avoided; a man may be a fornicator, an adulterer, a liar, a perjurer, a drunkard and glutton, a malignant, envious, contentious neighbour, covetous, a tyrant in his family; and in short guilty of almost all kinds of ungodliness, unrighteousness, and licentiousness; besides sins of omission of every kind without exception: and all this without endangering his salvation! Future happiness, according to this law, is secure, even to such a character, without repentance, conversion, faith in the Saviour, mercy, or any benefit from "the cove-"nants of promise." On the other hand, if a man have once committed idolatry, blasphemy, incest, murder, robbery, or theft; this law opens no door of faith or repentance; provides no refuge or redress; but leaves him under hopeless condemnation. It is not probable that all, perhaps any, of those who have spoken of this law, or these precepts, as actually given to Noah and his posterity,

meant the whole of this: but as the matter is stated, in this publication especially, these are the undeniable consequences of such a law given to men, by which the obedient, and none else, may obtain eternal life.

The third precept to 'appoint and constitute 'just and upright judges, that justice might be 'maintained and impartially administered to all,' could be obligatory upon very few, as few are concerned in the appointment of magistrates: and, if no other law, either from revelation or from man's reason and conscience, were in force, what could be the standard or rule of that *justice*, which was to be impartially administered?—We may therefore conclude, that these precepts of Noah never were inculcated by God for the purposes here spoken of: though some things afterwards incorporated into the ceremonial law of Moses were previously obligatory, with respect to the atoning sacrifices, and the *blood* especially, "which is the life," and that by which the atonement was made.[1]

We gentiles, however, have the less cause to complain of the Jews, in endeavouring exclusively to appropriate the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom, which they consider as altogether 'earthly;' while they allow us almost an equality, in those things which "accompany salvation with "eternal glory." And we would desire, in return for this liberality, to communicate to them, if possible, the inestimable blessings of the true Messiah's spiritual and eternal kingdom. "That

[1] Gen. ix. 4. Lev. xvii. 10—14.

" which we have seen and heard declare we unto " you; that ye may have fellowship with us: and " truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with " his Son Jesus Christ."[1]

P. 69. l. 24. 'There is a tradition,' &c. I foresaw that the seventy nations, before spoken of, (p. 49.) would introduce a difficulty about the descendents of Abraham, by Ishmael, by Keturah, and by Esau: but *tradition* comes in very conveniently to obviate or remove it: and, as the Jews have *tradition* almost wholly in their own power, it must always be at hand for their accommodation, whenever its help is wanted. As Mohammed, when pressed with any new difficulty, always had *a new revelation*, and added a new chapter to the Koran; often in part *contradictory* to those which had before been published; so, from the immense farrago of traditions in the Talmuds, some one may at any time be produced, by him who will bestow the pains to rummage for it, suited to the emergency, whatever it may be; but not always consistent with other authorities produced from the same inexhaustible store. Something further, however, still remains to be done about these 'seventy nations,' before the whole can stand free from insuperable objection. It will be needful to shew, how many of the seventy nations were destroyed, whether by deluges, or fire, or earthquake, to make room for all the descendents of Reu, Serug, Nahor, and Terah, except Abraham. The seventy nations are those mentioned in the tenth of Genesis.

[1] 1 John i. 3.

" By these were the nations divided in the earth " after the flood." [1] But no descendents of Heber, except Peleg, and his brother Joktan, are mentioned in that chapter: therefore, the descendents of Peleg, except Abraham, are there omitted; and *niches* must be provided for them, if they be admitted among the seventy.

P. 69. l. 31. ' Proof that there were no more ' than seventy nations.' The text from Deuteronomy, (p. 50. l. 29.) has already been considered. —(P. 70. l. 17.) It is indeed commanded that seventy bulls should be sacrificed on the several days of the feast of tabernacles;[2] and different methods have been taken of accounting for the singular arrangement of the number, as decreasing each day. But *tradition alone* informs us, that they were sacrifices for the seventy nations: and then this same *tradition* about these sacrifices is adduced as a *proof*, that there were seventy nations and no more! The *proof*, however, of this *tradition* itself will presently be considered.

P. 70. l. 26. ' Abraham and his family.—Next,' &c. There is nothing in this passage requiring particular notice; unless it be the notion of a *drawing* (l. 27.) and *subdrawing*; (p. 71. l. 6;) for which, I suppose, even tradition does not readily furnish authority, as it is not mentioned.—In this *drawing*, ' it is recorded, that a ' man by the name of Abraham *was* to appear in ' the world,' &c. Now it so happens, that the drawing was not made till long after Abraham's death!

[1] Gen. x. 32.

[2] Num. xxix. 12—32.

P. 71. l. 28. 'I say they are mistaken.' This may be compared with what has already been adduced concerning Shiloh, "and the gathering "of the people to him."

P. 72. l. 1. 'Everlasting possession.' It is impossible that any thing on earth can be *everlasting*, because the earth itself is not to endure for ever: neither does the original denote this. As, however, the seed of Abraham has not been possessed of the promised land, during more than seventeen hundred years past; the stubborn fact is against this interpretation. And, if it be said, that Israel shall be reinstated in Canaan, and possess it till the end of the world, (which I doubt not will be the case,) this does not in the least disprove our exposition of Jacob's prophecy. The sceptre and the lawgiver departed from Judah, as a nation, when Jesus came, and have been withheld from them ever since; which proves that Jesus is Shiloh, the promised Messiah.—The prophecy of Hosea, in the former part of it, has been turned into history: "The children of Israel "have abode many days without a king, and "without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and "without an image, and without an ephod, and "without teraphim." And I trust that, in answer to the prayers, and by the blessing of God on the exertions, of Christians, the latter part also shall soon become history: "Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their "God and David their King; and shall fear the "Lord and his goodness, in the latter days."[1]

[1] Hos. iii. 4, 5.

The *sceptre* and the *land* are not precisely the same thing: had God seen good, he might have continued the Jews in Canaan, and kept them in hard and oppressive bondage under the Romans, the Saracens, and the Turks, to this day, without *sceptre* and *lawgiver*; yet they might have lived in the promised land. It cannot be properly said, 'the sceptre is the land, and the land is the 'sceptre;' (p. 72. l. 34.) for a nation may have a country as their own to inhabit, and may yet be the abject slaves of a foreign despot in that land. Israel, however, for seventeen hundred years has neither had the land nor the sceptre.

P. 73. l. 13. 'The true explanation of the 'prophecy.' 'As long as Israel shall obey the 'law.' (l. 17.) Jacob did not speak one word about Israel obeying the law: how, indeed, should he? for the *law* was not yet given.—The possession of Canaan was *conditional*, and the sceptre also; but the coming of Shiloh was not.

P. 73. l. 29. 'The kingdom shall be restored to 'Israel.' *Then* certainly the kingdom has *departed* from Israel; else how could it be *restored*? Therefore Shiloh is come.

P. 74. l. 11. 'The argument of the gentiles, 'that the sceptre has departed from Judah.'—(l. 13.) 'Take notice,' &c.—This paragraph states the fact, according to our interpretation of the prophecy. When Jesus, the Son of David, came, he took the kingdom over Israel, and over all nations; whether they "would have him to 'reign over them," or not.[1] But Israel, as a

[1] Is. ix. 6, 7. Luke xix. 11—27.

nation, crucified their King, and still "crucify "him to themselves afresh." The sceptre then departed from Judah, as a people, that it might be swayed by Judah's most illustrious Descendent. And, when Israel shall welcome their long rejected King, they shall share the blessings of his kingdom preëminently; but never till that time.—"Thus "saith the Lord God, I will also take of the "highest branch of the high cedar, and will set "it; I will crop off from the top of his young "twigs a tender one; and will plant it upon a "high mountain and eminent. In the mountain "of the height of Israel will I plant it; and it "shall bring forth boughs, and bear fruit, and be "a goodly cedar: and under it shall *dwell all* "*fowl of every wing;* in the shadow of the "branches thereof shall they dwell. And all the "trees of the field shall know that I have brought "down the high tree, have exalted the low tree, "have dried up the green tree, and made the dry "tree to flourish. I the Lord have spoken and "have done it."[1]

The sceptre and the lawgiver were departing from Judah, as a nation, when Shiloh came, whose right they were. As his kingdom more and more attained establishment, the sceptre and lawgiver disappeared more and more from Judah: and at length, his spiritual rule being fully confirmed, the whole political as well as ecclesiastical state of the Jews was subverted, and continues so to this very day. "He shall be called the Son of

[1] Ezek. xvii. 22—24. See also Ezek. xxi. 26, 27. Dan. vii. 14.—Amos ix. 11, 12.

" the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto " him the throne of his father David; and he " shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; " and of his kingdom there shall be no end."[1]

P. 75. l. 27. 'The four empires were shewn to 'Abraham.' P. 76. l. 1. 'In the shape,' &c.— It was revealed to Abraham, that his seed should be in bondage in a strange land, till four hundred years were expired; and then God would bring them forth: and, respecting this, God made a covenant with him; and ordered him to prepare the animals here mentioned as a sacrifice, that the covenant might be ratified, with the customary rites and observances. Further than this Moses testifies nothing. The four kingdoms in Daniel were represented by a lion, a bear, a leopard, and a fourth beast, far more dreadful than any of them.[2] In a subsequent vision, a ram was the emblem of the Medo-Persian kingdom, and a he-goat of the Grecian: yet this he-goat is described as very powerful and formidable.[3] But in the dream of the four empires here given, a young heifer (not an ox or bull,) is the emblem of the first kingdom; a she-goat of the Persian; a ram of the Grecian; and a gentle, loving, harmless turtledove, of the tremendous Roman power!— 'In the shape of a bird he saw the family of 'Israel.' (p. 76. l. 6.) I suppose it is meant, that a young pigeon was an emblem of the Messiah's kingdom: but, according to the view of it given in this publication, it is scarcely more apposite than that of a turtle-dove, for the Roman victories

[1] Luke i. 31—33. [2] Dan. vii. 4—7. [3] Dan. viii. 1—8.

and domination! Do men, who amuse themselves and others with fancies of this kind, really believe them? However that may be, I cannot think they require any answer.

P. 77. l. 11. 'Although God made a covenant,' &c.—I am not disposed to object to Israel's primogeniture, or preëminence among the nations: but fathers in general have some affection, and make some provision, for other children, besides the first-born; nay, they sometimes disinherit the first-born for ill behaviour, and give the inheritance to their other children. This passage, however, concerning the unalienable right of the first-born, not only to the *inheritance*, but to the *subjection* of the other children as his *servants*, always to remain so, (p. 77, 78;) comes with rather an ill grace from *a Jew*. Not only was Ishmael older than Isaac; but Esau was Jacob's elder brother, by the same mother; and, by God's express appointment, "the elder was to be the "servant of the younger." Judah was younger than Reuben, and Simeon, and Levi; yet Jacob made him 'lord over all his brethren.' David was Jesse's youngest son; yet God chose him to be king over Israel. Solomon was not David's eldest surviving son: and, "of all my sons," says David, "God hath chosen Solomon to sit upon "the throne of the kingdom of the Lord over "Israel."[1] The general rule, therefore, admits of so many, and such important exceptions, that every argument grounded on it must be wholly inconclusive.

[1] 1 Chr. xxviii. 5.

P. 78. l. 4. ‘ Question.’—L. 6. ‘ His birth ‘ made him lord,’ &c.—I suspect, that Mr. C.’s *political sentiments*, which suppose subjects not born for themselves, but to be servants to the king, and to obey the orders of their king, (l. 10—14;) will not be much approved in this land of liberty; in which most men reasonably think, that kings and rulers are born, or advanced to authority, not for themselves, but for the benefit of the people; and will have a terrible account to render *to God at least*, if they neglect the welfare of their subjects, in order to please, and gratify, and aggrandize themselves. In respect of the kingdom of our God, who is infinite in wisdom, justice, truth, and goodness, the statement, though improperly expressed, might be admitted; and so in respect of the Messiah’s kingdom, which yet is established wholly for the benefit, not only of *subjects*, but of *rebels* who submit to him; the glory alone of his manifested wisdom, righteousness, truth, and love being reserved to himself. But, that God should appoint one nation so to rule over other nations, as that all others should be considered as born to obey the orders, *just* or *unjust*, *wise* or *foolish*, of this favoured people, gives such a view of the divine conduct, as is wholly unscriptural, irrational, and intolerable; and makes the heart recoil at the very thoughts of it.

P. 78. l. 20. ‘ His great seal, that is circum- ‘ cision.’—As by God’s express command, Ishmael, and the men of Abraham’s household, and the sons of Keturah and Esau were circumcised; this *great seal* has been given to many others, besides

Israel:[1] and, if this be the only token of dominion over all nations, there will be a danger of great competition about it, among the several nations who use circumcision at this day, and profess to derive it from Abraham. Even Ishmael and Edom may contest it with Israel.

P. 78. l. 27. 'The noun,' &c.—Learned men in general, whether Jews, Christians, or heathens, have hitherto agreed, that ISRAEL signifies "a "Prince of God." "Thy name shall be no more "called Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince hast "thou power with God and with men, and hast "prevailed."[2] "By his strength he had power "with God." יִשְׂרָאֵל is composed of שָׂרָה, *he obtained the dominion*, and אֵל God:—יִשְׂרָאֵל is, therefore, "a prince of God;" 'one who obtains 'principal power from God.' (*Leigh.*) SARAI, from the same root, signifies, *my princess*, SARAH *a princess.*

If, however, Mr. C., contrary to the text itself, and the general opinion of learned men, chooses to assign to the name another derivation; it is not a matter of such importance as to require a refutation. The derivation assigned seems to require ISHRAEL, not ISRAEL: as JESHURUN, not JESURUN.[3]

P. 78. l. 32. 'To Israel was delivered,' &c.—St. Paul calls "circumcision the seal;" but it was "the seal of the righteousness of the faith, which "Abraham had, being yet uncircumcised."[4] Circumcision is never called *a seal*, much less 'the

[1] Gen. xvii. 10—15. 23—27. [2] Gen. xxxii. 28. Hos. xii. 3—5.
[3] Deut. xxxii. 15. xxxiii. 5. [4] Rom. iv. 11.

'great seal,' in the Old Testament; nor yet 'the 'crown.' The scriptures of the Old Testament never speak of any special blessings as connected with the outward circumcision; but sometimes the contrary.[1] When peculiar blessings are promised, they are connected with "the circumcision "of the heart."[2] Indeed it is surprising, in examining this subject, to find how very seldom circumcision is mentioned in the Old Testament, except at its appointment, and when the Israelites were circumcised on entering Canaan.[3] There can, however, be no doubt that the apostle has summed up the instruction of the Old Testament on the subject, when he says, "That is not cir- "cumcision which is outward in the flesh: cir- "cumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not "in the letter; whose praise is not of men but of "God."[4]—'A great seal,' and 'a crown,' in which Edom, the type of the most inveterate enemies of Israel, participated equally with Israel, is not greatly to be gloried in.—The noun *circumcision* occurs but once in our version of the Old Testament.[5]

P. 79. l. 5. 'Israel was chosen and elected 'before the creation of this world to be the lord 'and king of it.'—It is rather unfavourable to this statement, that Israel, through so long a course of years, has had so little even of the appearance of dominion among the nations. This the writer felt, and anticipated the answer of the gentiles; and he tries in vain to repel it. Above 3500 years have passed since the calling of Abraham, and the

[1] Jer. ix. 25, 26. [2] Deut. xxx. 6. Jer. iv. 4.
[3] Gen. xvii. Josh. v. 2—9. [4] Rom. ii. 28, 29. [5] Ex. iv. 26.

institution of circumcision. More than 400 years passed before the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage:[1] 480 from that time to the building of Solomon's temple:[2] 434 more to the Babylonish captivity: 588 from the beginning of the captivity to the Christian æra, and above 1800 years since that commenced. Yet the reign of David, after he became king over all Israel, and that of Solomon, comprising together 73 years, is almost the only term in which they had any considerable dominion over other nations; and this was in comparatively a contracted circle, not extending over the twentieth part of the continent of Asia, and not at all including any part of Africa or Europe. So that, if dominion over the world was the grand *temporal* advantage intended for Israel, they have hitherto been unaccountably kept out of the possession of it. All the great kingdoms and empires, noted in history, have been possessed by the gentiles; and Israel was generally subjected to one or other of them. Now 3500 years are so large a part of the 7000 to which the author seems to limit the duration of the world; and another so large a part had elapsed before the calling of Abraham; that it seems impossible that this design of Israel's election should ever be answered.

The passage under consideration may, however, remind us of the answer which the Jews of old made to our Lord, and which has perplexed commentators. He had said "to those Jews which "believed in him, If ye continue in my word,

[1] Ex. xii, 41. [2] 1 Kings vi. 1.

" then are ye my disciples indeed: and shall know " the truth, and the truth shall *make you free.* " They answered him, We be Abraham's seed; " and were never in bondage to any man, how " sayest thou, Ye shall be made free?[1] The nation had been bondslaves in Egypt, captives at Babylon, and vassals to the three preceding great empires; Judea was at the time a province of the Roman empire, and deeply oppressed by that haughty power: yet they had " never been in " bondage to any man!"—The whole may also illustrate the words, 'And to this day Israel is still 'Israel:' not the same as in the days of their pious progenitors; but the same as in the days of Christ and his apostles.—St. Paul has given us the true meaning of the promises, to this effect: " The " promise, that he should be the heir of the world, " was not to Abraham and his seed through the " law, but through the righteousness of faith."[2] The Messiah to descend from him would be Lord of all the world: and all true believers of every age and nation, being considered as one with him, " inherit the earth," the world, " all things."[3]

P. 79. l. 16. 'It is a vain thing for the 'gentiles to grasp at the kingdom of this world.' —Whatever other gentiles may have, Christians, as such, have no controversy with Jews on this subject: they have no idea of 'grasping at the 'kingdom of this world:' Though *sons*, yet their valued inheritance is in heaven, not on earth. It

[1] John viii. 31—35. [2] Rom. iv. 13.
[3] Dan. vii. 13, 14, 27. 1 Cor. iii. 21—23. Gal. iii. 28, 29. Rev. iii. 21. v. 10. xi. 15. xxi. 7.

is nothing to them, whether gentile conquerors and oppressors exercise dominion over Jews, and treat them as abject slaves; or Jews exercise similar dominion over gentiles. The oppressed they compassionate, and condemn the oppressors: yet they at least equally pity them also. The *fact* is clearly as here stated; 'the gentiles are the lords of the 'world and Israel are their servants even until 'this day:' (l. 26.) the right or grant is another thing, as is the future superiority or dominion. These things however seldom occur to the thoughts of real Christians: and they severely condemn themselves, if conscious of any rising desire of rule and dominion, of this kind, over any human being. They know it to be wholly inconsistent with their principles, to rule with rigour over the meanest servant: all men are their *brethren*, if not in Christ, yet in Adam: and their *neighbours*, to be "loved as themselves." Even nominal Christians in general think little on the subject; nay, the pagan nations do not think of grasping in this sense 'at the kingdom of 'this world.' The idea seems peculiar to the Jews, and almost exclusively their own. I cannot conceive that it ever enters into the politics, either of the potentates on the continent, or the Grand Turk, or the Emperor of China; much less is it any part of the object of the London Society. The event will prove, whether the *vain* expectations of the Jews, from age to age, of temporal dominion over all nations, will ever be realized or not. I say *vain*: for what advantage could this be to all preceding generations, who have here lived in a state of vassalage, and have, previously to the expected period, en-

tered the eternal world? and what real advantage will the gratification of rapacity, ambition, love of domination, and vindictive passions, prove even to those who live at the expected time? An honourable precedency we allow will be given to converted and restored Israel; even that of cordial love and gratitude, for their and our Redeemer's sake. We know that, taught and influenced by Christian principles, they will bear these honours meekly and lovingly: and if God shall see good to invest them with any other authority; we know that they will exercise it in righteousness, truth and goodness; and that their fellow-Christians will cordially submit themselves in the fear of God. We feel, therefore, no concern on the subject. But we are fully convinced, that so long as their present ambition of dominion prevails, they never can be the subjects of the true Messiah. Till this be humbled and mortified, they never can receive the blessings of his kingdom. "The "loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the "haughtiness of man shall be made low; and the "Lord alone shall be exalted in that day."[1] As far as this is their expectation from their Messiah, they should enjoy it unmolested; did I not believe, yea certainly *know*, that they want a Messiah for far other and more important purposes, and are dying in their sins, because they believe not that Jesus is He.[2]

The statement in the rest of the passage might in many things be shewn to be doubtful or erroneous: but there seems nothing peculiarly

[1] Is. ii. 11. 17.

[2] John viii. 34.

requiring notice; nothing that affects the main argument.

P. 80. l. 34. 'The wilderness.—One question,' &c.—The reason assigned for the law having been given in a wilderness contains no argument, and has not much plausibility. It is probable, however, that the apostles at first thought, that the Gentiles would share the blessings of Messiah's reign by submitting to the law of Moses, and, as proselytes to Judaism, embracing also Christianity. But they were afterwards led to a different view of the subject. The ceremonial law of Moses never could combine with a religion which was to fill the whole earth.

P. 81. l. 12. 'The Sabbath.'—(L. 25.) 'Every 'person knows,' &c.—This *pairing* of the days, and *pairing* of the nations, is so entirely without foundation in scripture, and so remote from all deduction of reasoning or analogy, that one can hardly refrain from asking, Can any man be serious in maintaining such notions? In the *pairing* of the nations, we ought to have known which were joined together: and it can hardly help occurring to the reader, that, on the supposition of any thing of the kind having indeed taken place, it certainly was an introduction to stated and habitual quarrelling and fighting: for which pair have not repeatedly gone to war one with the other?

P. 82. l. 8. 'The world compared to a ship 'without a rudder.'—If Israel, as a nation, be the rudder to this ship, as the rudder was made so very long after the ship, and has had so very little connexion, in any age, with the greatest

part of it; no wonder that the ship has been tossed about by storms. But it is wonderful that men will amuse themselves and one another with these fancies, on the brink of death, and of an eternal state of happiness or misery; and upon subjects intimately connected with that awful alternative.

P. 82. l. 22. 'This compass,' &c.—That Israel should be the foundation of the law of Moses, and that law the compass of a ship, and that ship the world; and that law of Moses, the ritual part especially, never known to one part out of a hundred, or a thousand, of the world; these are very wonderful things: but they do not at all affect the question, whether Jesus be the promised Messiah or not.

P. 83. l. 2. 'Come then,' &c.—God gave Israel his sabbaths, but they greatly polluted them.[1] This seems the short history of this 'blessed pair.' —The question about the sabbath, as far as Christianity is concerned, will ere long be considered: and I by no means deny, that the sabbath, as given to Israel, was an honourable and important distinction and advantage; but merely to state, that they have little reason to glory in what has been so grievously neglected and perverted.

P. 83. l. 29. 'Millennium and properly,' &c.—the word *millennium* is not found in scripture; it simply means *a thousand years*. It is generally agreed that these thousand years, of which no intimation is given in the Old Testament, or in

[1] Ezek. xx. 12, 20, 21.

the New, except in the Revelation of St. John, will be passed under the especial rule of the Messiah, as the acknowledged, and willingly obeyed, King over all the earth: but that they comprise the whole term of his reign is not only not said, but it is directly contrary to many scriptures; especially that of Isaiah; "Of the increase of his "government and peace there shall be no end:"[1] and that of Daniel, concerning "the stone cut "out of the mountain without hands," which "became a great mountain, and filled the whole "earth."[2]

P. 83. l. 31. 'The opinion of the Gentiles con-'cerning the sabbath.' The views of Christians concerning the law of Moses have been sufficiently explained. Some things further concerning the abolition of the ritual law, as predicted in the Old Testament, will come under consideration, when the priesthood of the Messiah (a subject wholly omitted by Mr. C.) will call for our attention.

We certainly consider the dedication of a portion of our time, even of *one day in seven*, as a part of the *moral* law. It was appointed, as it appears evident to me at least, from the creation; and was merely *incorporated* into the law of Moses, being of previous and universal obligation. But perhaps it is not so easily ascertained, as at first glance it may appear to be, which of the seven days that constitute our weeks answers to the seventh day at the creation. A voyage round the world, whether it be entered upon in a wes-

[1] Is. ix. 7. [2] Dan. ii. 34, 35, 44, 45.

terly, or an easterly direction, always gains or loses one day in the computation. Two navigators setting sail on the same day, one taking his course to the East Indies, and returning by South America; and the other going by South America, and returning by the Cape of Good Hope; would vary *two days* in their computation of time: as one would proceed according to the daily course of the sun, and lose one whole day; and the other against the course of the sun, and would have one day over. Now which would be the seventh day of the week, to these two navigators? If the sabbath were only obligatory on the inhabitants of one small country, as Canaan, the difficulty would not be found: but, if extended to all nations, the sabbath would not consist of precisely the same individual hours, in any of the countries, either to the east or to the west.—But, however that may be, it appears to many Christians, provided one day in seven be thus consecrated to the worship and service of God, to the exclusion of all worldly employments, however lawful, if neither necessary, nor connected with piety and charity, that the *moral* obligation is satisfied. Not that *we* are to choose the day for ourselves: but that the determining which of the days, by our great Lawgiver, is a matter of *positive* appointment, and not of *moral* or *immutable* obligation. From the creation to the giving of the law, the seventh day was appointed, in commemoration of the creation being completed, "pronounced very "good," and rested in by the great Creator. And, though the intervention of the fall greatly altered the state of this lower creation, and of man espe-

cially, the original appointment continued. It appears to me also, (though this is not undisputed,) that the Mosaic sabbath was instituted on the same day of the seven: but the redemption from Egyptian bondage was added, as one great benefit to be commemorated by Israel on the sabbath; and this *redemption* we consider as typical of spiritual redemption by Jesus Christ. We, however, are satisfied, that "the Lord even of the "sabbath day," Jesus Christ the Son of God, has, *by his authority*, changed the *instituted* part of the command, and has appointed the first day of the seven, instead of the last, in commemoration of his resurrection: because that event, as completing his work of redemption, was of far greater importance, and an infinitely greater benefit to *fallen* man, than creation without redemption would have been. Our observation of the first day, as the Christian sabbath, is not 'derived 'from what Paul said;'[1] but from the general language of the New Testament, and the general practice of the primitive Christians, in the apostles' days. It is by the apostle John called "the "Lord's day:"[2] τῇ Κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, as St. Paul calls the eucharist, Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον.[3] The same authority which, as we suppose, abolished the other festivals of the ceremonial law, changed the ceremonial part of this law. "The first day of the week" is, subsequently to our Lord's resurrection, distinguished from other days;[4] and sabbaths are put among those ritual observances which are no

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 2. [2] Rev. i. 10. [3] 1 Cor. xi. 20.
[4] John xx. 19, 26. Acts xx. 7. 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

nger in force.[1] With this the constant practice the Christian church accords: and every argu-ent, which proves Christianity to be from God, tablishes this change in the day of sacred rest. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it:" for "the Stone, which the builders refused," on this day arose, at he might "become the head-stone of the corner."[2] If indeed God said to the apostles on e mount, as we believe, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; HEAR YE HIM:" and if he, as it is manifest, made known s will to the apostles concerning this change of e day; then the same authority, which appointed e seventh day, for wise and holy reasons sub-tuted the first in its place. But it pleased God at this change, as some others, should be gra-ally introduced, rather by apostolical example, an by direct injunction; that no needless mbling block might be thrown in the way of e Jews.

P. 84. l. 26. 'Type,' &c.—It is no where in ipture said, that 'the sabbath is a type of the illennium:' but, if it were, this would confirm e view which we have of it, namely, that in some spects it was a part of *instituted worship*. The ostle shews that he considered it as a figure or ticipation of heavenly happiness, when he says, There remaineth therefore a rest," (σαββατισμός, e keeping of a sabbath,) "for the people of God."

[1] Col. ii. 16. [2] Ps. cxviii. 22—24. Acts iv. 10, 11.

P. 84. l. 31. 'They have no right to keep holy,' &c.—To have *no right* to obey the command of God, seems an uncommon idea or expression.—The rest of the paragraph does not require any particular answer. Christians consider the festivals, as well as other parts of the ceremonial law, as abolished; and they judge that the moral part of the fourth commandment is obeyed, by observing the Lord's day, if it be indeed kept as the Lord's day should be.

P. 85. l. 10. 'The day of atonement.'—P. 86. l. 6. 'A little sanctuary.'—It is rather difficult to conceive how *many* synagogues, widely dispersed through distant countries, could be "a little "sanctuary." I have no doubt that believing and humble Israelites of old worshipped God by prayer and praise, with acceptance at the synagogues, wherever dispersed: but this was always with a reference to the tabernacle and temple, where alone sacrifices, *atoning* sacrifices, were appointed to be offered. The NAME and perfections of God,[1] his grace, and providence, and promises, trusted in by a few prudent, pious Jews, was to them as "a little sanctuary;" when they could not go up to the temple. Their worship was accepted, wherever presented, through the ministrations of the priests, and the *atoning* sacrifices offered "in the place which God had chosen "to place his name there."[2] But since the coming of the Messiah, and the rejection of him by the Jews, we Christians must think that the

[1] Ps. xx. 1. Prov. xviii. 10. [2] Is. viii. 13—15.

efficacy of the typical sacrifices has ceased, and that no worship is acceptable from those who reject the substance of all those types.

P. 86. l. 10. 'Sacrifices.'—We acknowledge that a broken spirit, and some other things, are "*spiritual* sacrifices," of far higher value than any sacrifices of animals burnt on altars, except when these were offered with reference to the great antitype and his atonement: but we consider these *spiritual* sacrifices as required by the *moral* law, or as connected with the "gospel of our "salvation." Indeed, to speak of synagogues, and the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, in answer to the argument that there exists no temple, or any such sacrifices as the ceremonial law prescribed; is merely to *evade* the conclusion manifestly deducible from the undeniable fact. We simply inquire, Are these the sacrifices appointed by Moses to be offered on the day of atonement? Are they offered in obedience to the *ceremonial* law? The answer is, 'In our 'dispersions we cannot offer these; and we do what we can.' Be it so: but is not this the very thing that we maintain; that God, in proof that the *ritual* law is abolished, has rendered the observance of it, in its most *essential* requirements, impracticable even to those who would observe it? We allow that the *moral* law remains in full force: but that the *ritual* law of Moses, having answered its purpose, is abolished, and in fact cannot be observed. Now to shew that sacrifices required by the *moral* law, or certainly not appointed in the *ritual* law, may still be offered

by the Jews, even in their dispersions, confirms instead of answering, our argument.

P. 86. l. 16. 'Now when,' &c.—It is no part of our present concern, to inquire into the nature of the services, said to be performed by the Jews in the synagogue on the day of atonement: this at least is certain, that they do not, and cannot, perform the sacrifices and ceremonies, instituted in the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus. The temple, the holy of holies, the high priest; his own sin-offering, the sin-offering for the people; the two goats, and the entrance of the high priest into the holiest, with the blood of the sacrifices, and the burning of incense; these, and other things, essential to the observance of that day, as a part of the *ritual* law of Moses, and *typical* of good things to come, have been wholly disused for above seventeen hundred years.

Several parts of the *ritual* law may be performed by the Jews in their dispersions, and some are attended to: but who can read the books of Moses, especially Leviticus, without a deep conviction, that the priesthood of Aaron's family, the altar, the sacrifices of innocent and clean animals, with the shedding and sprinkling of blood, and the burning of incense; as connected with the tabernacle, the holy of holies, the ark, and the mercy-seat; are the most *appropriate* and *central* parts of the *ritual* law? In fact all the rest had such an intimate connexion with these, that, take away the sanctuary, the priesthood, and the sacrifices; and the whole must appear as broken and scattered fragments of a fabric, once grand, but now

irrecoverably destroyed and shattered to pieces. "Almost all things were by the law purged with "blood, and without shedding of blood, there was "no remission." From the entrance of sin, till the death of Christ, this principle pervaded every dispensation: but a short time after that event, this was entirely superseded. Christians offer no sacrifices with shedding of blood; and for seventeen hundred years Jews have offered none. This extraordinary change, this sudden cessation of the whole system of blood-shedding, which had continued from the fall of Adam, as connected with acceptable worship of the true God, must surely require some explanation; and that, however it took place, whether by express divine appointment, as Christians suppose, or by the dispensations of providence, as the Jews must allow: for *chance* and *fortune* are out of the question; in one way or other, "it is the Lord's doing, and it is mar-"vellous in our eyes."

And here, I shall introduce a few remarks on a subject, wholly omitted by Mr. C. namely, the PRIESTHOOD of the promised Messiah. He indeed admits, that *priests*, as well as kings and prophets, were anointed under the law: (p. 15:) and, if so, they were typically MESSIAHS; but he waves all further notice of this part of prophecy. Had we no other evidence of Messiah's priesthood than that to be derived from types, analogy, and intimation of a sacrifice for sin to be offered by the Messiah; the proof might perhaps be rejected as inconclusive. But it is most explicitly predicted of the Messiah, and in a Psalm, which Mr. C. does not deny to belong to him: "The Lord hath

"sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest for "ever, after the order of Melchisedek."[1] It is also foretold by Zechariah, "Behold the Man, "whose name is the BRANCH: and he shall grow "up out of his place; and he shall build the "temple of the Lord. Even he shall build the "temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the "glory; and he shall sit and rule upon his "throne; and he shall be a Priest upon his "throne; and the counsel of peace shall be be-"tween them both."[2] It is in vain to attempt explaining this either of Zerubbabel or of Joshua. Zerubbabel, even if his authority might be considered as that of "a king upon his throne," (which was far from the case,) was not, and could not be A PRIEST. Joshua, the priest, did not sit and "rule on his throne:" but the two persons, exercising separately the *ruling* and the *sacerdotal* office, formed a type and shadow of "the "BRANCH,"[3] in whom the two characters of King and Priest would be combined; and, from this union, "the counsel of peace" and reconciliation between God and man would be accomplished.

The Messiah was, as all acknowledge, to be the descendent of Judah, and of king David; and these prophecies therefore, of his being a Priest, are in fact express *predictions* of the abolition of the whole Mosaic ceremonial: according to which, no one, except of the tribe of Levi, and the family of Aaron, might on any account act as priests. Whatever objections Jews may have to the *authority* of St. Paul, it behoves them to inquire whether his *argu-*

[1] Ps. cx. 4. [2] Zech. vi. 12, 13. [3] Is. xi. 1, 2.

ments can be answered on this subject. "If there-
"fore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood;
"(for under it the people received the law;) what
"further need was there that another Priest should
"arise after the order of Melchisedek, and not be
"called after the order of Aaron? For, the
"priesthood being changed, there is made of ne-
"cessity a change also of the law: for he, of whom
"these things are spoken, pertaineth to another
"tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the
"altar.[1]" How could the *ritual* law of Moses continue in force, under a priest of the tribe of Judah, of the family of David, and "after the order "of Melchisedek?" The Messiah's priesthood, as being "after the order of Melchisedek," a King and a priest at the same time, a priesthood in which, like Melchisedek, he had no predecessor and would have no successor; that of one "who abideth a "priest continually," and for ever; of one whose priesthood was confirmed by an oath, the irrevocable oath of JEHOVAH:[1] all these things, and several other circumstances might be enlarged on: but it suffices for our purpose, that the Messiah was predicted as "a Priest for ever," as well as a King, though he was not to arise from the family or tribe, to which by the law of Moses the priesthood was absolutely restricted.

It is remarkable that Melchisedek, after the brief and indeed obscure account of him by Moses,[2] is never once mentioned in the Old Testament, except in this remarkable prophecy of the Messiah: nor in the New, except in this argument of the

[1] Heb. vii. [2] Gen. xiv. 18—20.

apostle to the Hebrews, concerning the ritual law; and as shewing that it was especially a type of the blessings of the Messiah's atonement and intercession. The whole seems to have been arranged by the Holy Spirit, for this one express purpose.

If then, the apostle's *argument*, (to say nothing of his inspiration,) be *unanswerable;* (which I venture to say it is;) and if the shedding and sprinkling of blood, with the burning of incense, under the law, were shadows of the all-atoning sacrifice of Christ, and his all-prevailing intercession: if *He* was indeed "the Lamb slain from the "foundation of the world;" so that the shedding of blood, even before the law, was needful to remission and acceptance: it is sufficiently clear, why, after his atonement had been made, and his intercession, as our High Priest in heaven, openly revealed, the shedding and sprinkling of blood, and the burning of incense, with the whole institution of the Levitical sanctuary and priesthood, should at once terminate. The *thing signified* was come; *the sign* was no longer needful.—This makes the whole satisfactory on Christian principles; but the cessation of bloody sacrifices, now for above 1700 years after they had been continued through 4000 years preceding, can never be explained on the principles of the Jews.—The subject, however, will again come under consideration, when the scriptures relating to the sufferings, death, resurrection, intercession, and glory of the promised Messiah, (a subject wholly omitted by Mr. C.,) shall be brought forward, and distinctly examined.

P. 86. l. 30. 'Seventy nations.'—The seventy nations, and the age of Abraham at the building of Babel, have occupied enough of our attention: the whole is destitute of foundation, and indeed inconsistent with the scripture.

P. 86. l. 34. 'The Lord made a covenant with 'Abraham.—Abraham was seventy years old.'—Moses expressly records that "Abram was seventy "and five years old when he departed out of "Haran."[1] Some time occurred after this before God entered into covenant with him;[2] and he was "ninety-nine years of age," when circumcision, the outward seal of the covenant, was instituted.[3] These scriptural dates are quite sufficient to sweep away the cobweb of the seventy nations, seventy years, seventy descendents, seventy angels, &c. It is wonderful that a Jew, writing on such an argument, and building so very much on these numbers, should not have previously examined the dates of his Hebrew Bible!

P. 87. l. 25. 'Every nation,' &c.—Daniel's words shew no more than that the angel who spake to him was, *on that particular occasion*, commissioned to aid the kings of Persia. How absurd it is to suppose, that God so left the nations of the earth to guardian angels, that these angels, aiding Persia, or Greece, should fight, by God's approbation, against each other! or that he should commission one angel to help this nation, and another to help that nation, in direct opposition to one another! just like the gods and goddesses in Homer's Iliad, or Virgil's Æneid!

[1] Gen. xii. 4. [2] Gen. xv. [3] Gen. xvii. l. 24.

P. 81. l. 1. 'From the destruction of the first 'temple,' &c.—It has been shewn, that above six hundred and fifty years intervened between the destruction of the first temple and that of the second: but, apart from the chronological computation, the language of the angel, "from the "going forth of the commandment to restore and "to build Jerusalem," cannot possibly allow us to date the seventy weeks from the desolation of the first temple.

P. 88. l. 17. 'Account.—From the covenant'—l. 20. 'From the desolation,' &c.—I shall not stay to inquire how far this computation agrees with one before given. (p. 67.) Neither of them proceeds on any fixed principles of chronology which can stand the test of examination; and enough has been said to shew that the *seventy* jubilees have no foundation in scripture.

P. 88. l. 31. 'By this calculation,' &c.—Mr. C.'s conjectures, in this passage, coincide with those of some Christian expositors of prophecy: but how far recent events operate to deduct from the vast importance given, by these calculations or conjectures, to the French revolution, or to subvert the whole system, I do not determine. He who lives at the end of the thirty-six years, here mentioned, will know whether the passage printed in capitals has then been verified. A former calculation left 137 years yet to pass, before these expected events: (p. 67.) but 'the end of the 'things' seems to have been '*shortened*,' to make it concur with the French revolution: and, should the Bourbons be again established on the throne of France, as it is probable that they will, the end

may perhaps be again *lengthened.* I do not, however, at all profess to prophesy from prophecy. Our posterity will be more competent judges than we are.

P. 89. l. 6. 'Israel is separated for ever from 'all nations,' &c.—There is an important meaning in which this position is grounded on scripture: Israel will never be finally or totally mixed with the other nations of the earth; but will be gathered from their present dispersions, to reside, as a separate nation, in their own land. But Mr. C. is neither consistent with scripture, nor with himself, when he avers, 'that all the gentiles 'will not worship the true God even until the 'last day.'

P. 89. l. 24. 'Moses foretold,' &c. P. 90. l. 2. 'But what,' &c.?—The writer of the thirty-fourth chapter of Deuteronomy, whether Joshua, or Samuel, or some other prophet, previous to the captivity, or Ezra, merely stated the fact; that, at the time when he wrote, there had not arisen a prophet in Israel like unto Moses, &c.[1] but he by no means asserted that there would never be another prophet equal to Moses. This indeed would be *directly* to contradict the words of Moses himself. Christians maintain, that the Messiah (not the 'Messiah of the gentiles,' as distinguished from some other Messiah,) was predicted, as "a prophet like unto Moses;" and that he was far superior to Moses. And, if the Messiah were indeed to be a prophet, (as the name imported, p. 16.) one would suppose that even Jews

[1] Deut. xxxiv. 10—12.

themselves would allow him to be a prophet at least *equal* to Moses.

P. 90. l. 6. 'The text says, I will put my words 'in his mouth,' &c.—God says to Moses, "Thou "shalt speak to him," (Aaron,) "and put words "in his mouth,"[1] Does this text prove that Moses and Aaron did not "speak face to face" with each other?

P. 90. l. 8. 'Again, what honour,' &c.—It seems of little use to dispute, whether the prophet or the high priest in Israel were the more honourable character; especially, as Israel, during so many ages, has had neither the one nor the other.

The reader, may, however, be reminded, that God instructed even "the child Samuel," as a *prophet*, to warn and rebuke Eli *the high priest*;[2] that Josiah sent "Hilkiah, *the high priest* to the "*prophetess* Huldah, to inquire of God by her."[3] "And by a prophet the Lord brought Israel out of "Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved."[4] Moses was a prophet, and a priest, and "a king "in Jeshurun." As a priest he anointed and consecrated Aaron and his sons. In this union of the three offices respecting which *anointing* was prescribed; and in his being a mediator between God and Israel, and mediator of the Sinai covenant; Moses was especially a type of the Messiah. Various other particulars might be mentioned, in which a most remarkable coincidence between Moses and Jesus Christ appears: perhaps indeed there are more points of similarity, than between

[1] Ex. iv. 15. [2] 1 Sam. iii.
[3] 2 Kings xxii. 8 - 14. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9—22. [4] Hosea xii. 13.

any other two persons who ever lived on earth. The above, however, seems the great outline of the prediction delivered by Moses, concerning "a prophet like unto him."—But, even to the close of the Old Testament canon, "no prophet had "arisen," in these respects, at all like unto Moses; nor has there arisen any since, except Jesus Christ. Neither does it appear, according to Mr. C., that there ever will: for he passes over the priesthood of the Messiah, and speaks not very clearly of his prophetical character. Some notice will ere long be taken of his interpretation of the prophecy: but the application made of the prophecy by the apostle Peter, and by Stephen the first martyr of Jesus;[1] compared with the state of the Jewish nation, ever since they crucified the Lord Jesus, and finally refused to hearken to him; gives immense weight to our interpretation of the passage.

We maintain, then, that Moses predicted the Messiah, "the light of the gentiles, and the glory "of his people Israel," as a "prophet like unto "himself;" a Lawgiver and King, a Priest and a Prophet, a Mediator of a covenant between God and his people; and as introducing a new dispensation to the worshippers of the true God, which Moses also had done.

Every text in the Old Testament, which speaks of the Messiah as "sending forth his law," as "teaching the people," as "the light of the "people," and of the gentiles," shews that he "would be a prophet and the Sun of Righteous-"ness."[2]

[1] Acts iii 22, 23. vii. 37. [2] Is. xlii. 1—4. 6. 7. xlix. 6. lv. 3, 4. lix. 20, 21. lxi. 1—3. Mal. iv. 2.

P. 90. l. 19 'When the Messiah shall come, he 'will have,' &c.—Some events in providence will doubtless occur during the reign of the Messiah, even according to the notion of the Jews; and these events may be predicted a long time before they take place.—But the word *prophet* does not necessarily mean one who foretels future events: but one who, by immediate revelation, makes known the will of God to man.—In every sense however we consider the Messiah, not only as a prophet, but as, in some respects, the ONLY PROPHET: and all other prophets as speaking to men the revelation which Immanuel hath received from the Father.

P. 90. l. 25. 'Prophecies of Jesus.' P. 91. l. 5. 'We shall go backward,' &c.—There is not the slightest shadow of proof that David wrote the hundred and thirty-seventh Psalm: and indeed the supposition is extremely unreasonable. It is far more likely that Ezekiel did. That the first verse of this Psalm, in which no mention is made of the desolations of the temple, should be assumed to be a *prediction* of the destruction of the first temple by the Chaldeans; and the seventh, concerning the subversion, not of the temple, but of Jerusalem, and the exultations of Edom over it, should be a *prediction* of the destruction of the second temple; shews a talent at expounding scripture, which sets criticism at defiance. A plain fact, that Zion was desolated, and that Edom exulted, and a *prediction* of Babylon's destruction, form the substance of the Psalm. When this prediction should be fulfilled, the Psalmist called on the Lord to remember Edom.—Whether events yet future were not also thus prëintimated, I do not here determine.

It is not requisite, however, to dwell on these things: no judicious Christian will deny, that our Lord's predictions, in many respects, coincided with those of the ancient prophets. (p. 90, 91.) But the claim of Jesus to be a prophet, as predicting future events, and not as merely 'quoting predictions previously delivered by the ancient 'prophets,' is sufficiently supported, in the judgment of all reasonable and impartial men, by the following considerations.—He foretold the total destruction of the temple, so "that one stone "should not be left upon another;" and the desolation of Jerusalem, as certainly to take place *within the term of the existing generation;* subjoining a variety of preceding circumstances, no where in the Old Testament connected with those events, or but obscurely hinted. There was not, when he delivered this prediction, the least probability, that such entire desolations should so speedily occur: and not a single Jew, except the disciples of Jesus, could endure the thought of such desolations, without indignation and abhorrence.[1] He also added, "They" (the Jews) "shall be led away captive into all nations; and "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the gentiles, "until the time of the gentiles be fulfilled."[2] This has now been accomplishing for above 1700 years. Daniel and Zechariah had indeed foretold the desolations of the temple and of Jerusalem, subsequent to the captivity; and Moses and the prophets had, in general terms, foretold a long-continued dispersion of Israel, for their sins,

[1] Acts vi. 13, 14. [2] Luke xxi. 24.

among the nations of the earth: but the abject subjection of the holy city to the heathen, is not mentioned by the prophets, or even hinted at, except in an obscure and distant manner. Especially, the long series of ages, during which "Jerusalem should be trodden under foot of the "gentiles," is no where intimated: and this event was so unprecedented and so unexpected, that the prediction of it was equivalent to a prophecy wholly original. Not a Jew on earth, (without excepting even the disciples,) with the Old Testament in his hand, had the least expectation of such a catastrophe: and there has not been any period, since the dispersion of the nation, in which the Jews have not expected their restoration long before the present era. The predictions of the subversion of the ecclesiastical and political estate of the Jews, with the desolations of the temple and city, and immense slaughter of the people, and entire dispersion of the rest, were predicted, as to be accomplished during that generation; and the fulfilment was notorious to all the world. The other parts have been fulfilling through every age to this day: and neither Jew nor Christian knows exactly when the termination of the dispersion, and the rescuing of Jerusalem from the gentiles, shall take place.

P. 93. l. 17. 'Oral law.'—We here come to the stronghold of Judaism, as opposed to Christianity. It was so in our Lord's time;[1] and it became so more and more in subsequent ages. The specimen, which Jesus gave of the nature and ten-

[1] Matt. xv. 3—9. Mark vii. 8—12.

dency of this *oral law*, or " the traditions of the " elders," as requiring a man to break the clearest and most express command of God, *written* in the law of Moses, rather than fail of compliance with the traditions of the elders, is only one instance out of many, which might be adduced of the same kind. ' A man may be so bound by ' them,' (the traditions,) ' that he cannot, without ' great sin, do what God has in his law com- ' manded to be done. So that if he made a vow, ' which laid him under the obligation to violate ' God's law, that he might observe it; his vow ' must stand, and the law be abrogated.' (*Jewish Canon in Pocock.*) In like manner, the Papists, having established it as a principle, that ' the tra- ' ditions of the church ' are of equal authority with the written word, or even superior to it; are inaccessible (while they adhere to this principle,) to all arguments from the scriptures. ' The Jews tell us, that at the same time, when ' God gave unto Moses the written law in Mount ' Sinai, he gave unto him also the interpretation ' of it; commanding him to commit the former ' to writing, but to deliver the other only by word ' of mouth, to be transmitted down from genera- ' tion to generation by tradition only: from hence ' the former is called the *written*, and the other ' the *oral* law.'—' But all this is mere fiction, ' spun out of the fertile invention of the Talmud- ' ists, without the least foundation in scripture, ' or in any authentic history.'—' The truth of the ' matter' is this. After the death of Simeon the ' Just, there arose a sect, called the *Tannaim*, or ' the *Mishnical* doctors, that made it their business

'to study and descant upon those traditions, 'which had been received and allowed by Ezra, 'and the men of the great synagogue,[1] and to 'draw inferences and consequences from them; 'all which they engrafted into the body of these 'ancient traditions, as if they had been as authentic 'as the other: which example being followed by 'those who afterwards succeeded them in this 'profession, they continually added their imagi-'nations to what they had received from those 'that went before them; whereby these traditions 'becoming, as a snowball, the further they rolled 'down, from one generation to another, the more 'they gathered, and the greater the bulk of them 'grew.—Thus it went on to the middle of the 'second century after Christ; by which time 'they found it necessary to put all these traditions 'into writing. For they were grown to so great 'a number, and enlarged to so huge a heap, as to 'exceed the possibility of being any longer pre-'served by the memory of men.—Rabbi Judah, 'the son of Simeon, president of the Sanhedrim, 'methodically digested all that had hitherto been 'delivered to them of their law and religion, by 'the tradition of their ancestors. This is the book 'called the *Mishnah*.'—'This with the comments 'on it, make up both their *Talmuds*, that is, the 'Jerusalem Talmud and the Babylonish Talmud: 'the former is published in one large folio:— 'the last edition of the latter is in twelve folios.' (*Dean Prideaux.*)

[1] What the learned and laborious writer here admits as *fact*, stands on no scriptural ground; and it grants more than ought to be conceded in the argument.

The reader may find in Prideaux's Connexion, Part I. Book 5. much more information on this subject: but these extracts must suffice for our present purpose.

An excellent friend of mine[1] used to say, that 'a story is at first like a bit of wire; but one 'polishes it, another heads it, and another points 'it, and so it becomes a *pin*.' Every one who considers how circumstantial alterations, in reporting any fact, take place, as it passes from one person to another, even without any *intentional* misrepresentation, must be aware, that oral tradition, except in a few simple principles, maxims, and rules, must, without a greater and more constant miracle than any recorded in scripture, be a most vague and uncertain mode of transmission: especially when interpretations, additions, exceptions, and limitations of six hundred and thirteen precepts are in this manner to be transmitted from one to another, during the course of three thousand years! But I forget: the snowball grew at length too large: it became necessary to *write* the *oral* law; and thirteen folios are filled with it, and with the comments on it!

If a man should publish the Bible in English, with all the discordant expositions which have ever been given of it; it would not be a more heterogeneous mass, than this *written* and *expounded oral* law; and it would not contain half, if the tenth part, of the grossly *offensive* and pernicious things comprised in it.

Our Lord, who taught his disciples to observe

[1] Rev. John Newton, Rector of St. Mary, Woolnoth.

the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, and to obey the scribes as "sitting in Moses's seat," and teaching his doctrine; most decidedly protested against "the traditions of the elders," and taught his disciples and the people to do the same. Nor is there any prospect, of succeeding in our attempts to bring the Jews to embrace Christianity; so long as we, either *timidly*, or by a mistaken *policy*, allow them to retire unmolested behind these entrenchments. These strongholds must fall; or they must be drawn forth from them to the fair ground of "the law and the testimony," the written word of God; before our arguments, in other respects, will receive any adequate attention from them.

P. 93. l. 18. 'Moses received,' &c.—If Moses received the oral law, how is it that he gives no intimation of it, either in connexion with other laws, or in his addresses to the people, his charges to Joshua, his prophetic song, or his blessings on the tribes of Israel? How is it that he gives such plain commands of quite a contrary nature?[1] How is it that the written law was to be set before the people, every seventh year, at the feast of tabernacles,[2] but not a hint of any other law? Not a hint from Joshua, the next in order, (l. 22,) but the contrary;[3] or from any of the twelve judges, (l. 23,) the next successors mentioned? Some quotations they made from the written law, but no allusion to the oral law. Many of the persons mentioned in this transmission of the

[1] Deut. iv. 2. xii. 32.
[2] Deut. xxxi. 9—13.
[3] Josh. i. 8. xxiii. 6.

oral law have left us nothing on record; (l. 24—28;) none of them any thing favourable to it. Isaiah's appeal is "to the law and to the testimony."[1] Hosea says, in the name of God, "I have *written* "unto him the great things of my law;"[2] but not a word about any oral law. This must be wholly unaccountable, if any such oral law existed. But, in fact, this oral law was not invented till after the close of the Old Testament canon: and it is never mentioned in any writings prior to the New Testament, as far as I have any opportunity of learning. Either Josiah had never heard of it, or it was something widely different from the written law; else his consternation at finding and reading the latter would not have been so great.[3] Ezra and Nehemiah ordered every thing according to the written law; constantly referred to it, and read it to the people.[4] Malachi calls on the people, saying, "Remember "ye the law of Moses."[5] Had he been asked, what law, would he not have said, that contained in the Pentateuch?

P. 94. l. 10. 'Malachi was—the great seal,' &c. I do not understand in what sense 'Malachi was 'the great seal of the Old Testament,' except as his short prophecy is placed last among the prophetical books of that sacred volume. Nor does it appear, (however his prophecy, that God would "send Elijah, the prophet, before the coming of "the great and dreadful day of the Lord," may be interpreted,) what way it can prove 'that there

[1] Is. viii. 20. xxix. 11—13. [2] Hos. viii. 12.
[3] 2 Kings xxii. 9—13. [4] Ezra ix. 10—14. Neh. viii. ix. x. 28—39. xiii. 1—3.
[5] Mal. iv. 4.

'should be no more a prophet in Israel, until the 'restoration of Israel.' Not a word is said on that subject in the context; and "the great and "dreadful day of the Lord" evidently means "the "day which shall burn as an oven; and all the "proud, yea, and all that do wickedly shall "be stubble: and the day that cometh shall "burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it "shall leave them neither root nor branch." These are contrasted with the opposite character. "But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun "of righteousness arise, with healing in his "wings," &c. Nothing is hinted about gentiles: two opposite characters *among the Jews* are most clearly described, with reference to the preceding chapter:[1] and the day spoken of is that of dreadful destruction on the proud, wicked, and obstinate Jews; such as took place, at the desolation of Jerusalem and the temple by the Romans, and not that of 'the restoration of Israel.'—But, even if this were not so, the promise of one prophet being sent does not necessarily imply that no other would be sent.

P. 94. l. 21. 'Each receiver was as God[2] in his 'age, as Moses in his age.'—This is assuming a very high ground indeed for the oral law; and it naturally occurs to inquire, Who is the receiver in this present day? for he may perhaps prove a rival to "the man of sin," described by St. Paul, "who opposeth, and exalteth himself above all "that is called God, and worshipped; so that he

[1] Comp. Mal. iii. 1—6, 11—18. iv. 1—3.

[2] So it is in Mr. C.'s book: but I doubt whether *good* is not meant.

" as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing " himself that he is God:" [1] especially as *oral tradition*, not the written word of God, is the sole support of the infallibility of each competitor. If, however, it be answered, that none in this age makes this high claim; we further ask, 'Who 'was the last of these infallible and *divine* re- 'ceivers?' And how can we know, whether those who have since handed down these oral traditions, either by word of mouth, or in large books, have *infallibly* communicated what they received from the last of those who 'was as God in his age?' Till these things be clearly ascertained, we remain in the same uncertainty or hesitation as before; or rather we are the more convinced that so arrogant a claim must be unfounded.

P. 94. l. 28. 'The seventy elders,' &c.—Mr. C. before maintained that all Israel were prophets, (p. 45,) but here only the seventy elders.—(L. 30.) 'Only Moses,' &c.—Eldad and Medad, at least, of these prophets, are mentioned.[2]—Will learned and considerate Jews fully approve of this statement: that 'each of these prophets was as 'good in his day, as Moses was in his?' (p. 95. l. 2.) It may be proper to compare this passage, with what has been before considered, when Mr. C. was interpreting the words, " And there arose not " a prophet since in Israel, like unto Moses, whom " the Lord knew face to face:" 'Which is,' says he, 'that there never will be another prophet like 'unto Moses.' (p. 90.) Were the words adduced[3] added by Joshua? Then Joshua 'was as good

[1] 2 Thes. ii. 3, 4. [2] Num. xi. 6, 27. [3] Deut. xxxiv. 10.

'in his age as Moses was in his.' The same consequence must follow, whoever added the clause contained in the last chapter of Deuteronomy.—But indeed was it possible, that Moses could be more than 'God in his own age?' If not, then every prophet and every scribe, according to the account here given, must have been at least equal to Moses. And the further distant from the death of Moses we remove the insertion of these words, the greater difficulty must they involve: as not only one prophet, but many prophets, in this sense, "like unto Moses," and equal to him, had been already raised up, when they were written.—The plural number also can never accord to the prediction of Moses, "of "a prophet like unto him:" and GOD did not put his words into the mouth of these receivers;[1] but they put it in the mouth, each of his successor, from age to age, according to the statement here given. It is, however, enough to ask, whether each of them, like Moses, united in himself the distinct offices of prophet, priest and king? Whether each of them was a lawgiver, and introduced a new dispensation of religion, as Moses did? And whether each of them acted as mediator between God and Israel, in establishing a covenant? It was in no wise peculiar to Moses, or to the prophets here mentioned, that 'what they desired of God, 'he granted them.' It is the privilege of all true believers, as far as they ask according to the will of God.—"Delight thyself in the Lord, and he "shall give thee the desires of thy heart."[2] Even

[1] Deut. xviii. 18. [2] Ps. xxxvii. 4.

Moses, when he earnestly desired and prayed that he might pass over Jordan, was refused.[1] Samuel prayed all night against the rejection of Saul,[2] but did not prevail. And, when Elijah impatiently prayed for death, God did not grant his request.[3]

P. 95. l. 28. 'Galatians.'—This whole passage (p. 95—99) requires little answer. A law concerning any *particular description of persons* is no law to those who are not of that particular description. The commands to parents and children, to husbands and wives, in the letter of them, are not binding on those who do not stand in these relations to others. "The woman that hath an "husband is bound by the law to her husband; "but, if the husband be dead, she is loosed from "the law of her husband."[4] The same is, in the judgment of the common sense of all mankind, the case of the several laws respecting the priests and Levites, the Nazarites, the lepers, and others. This having been noticed, all the *strange* speeches put into the mouths of different persons introduced, as actors upon a stage, in these pages, may be left to the reader without any answer; for how can a man break a law, or fall under the condemnation of it, who never was in the situation expressly specified in it?

P. 99. l. 29. to p. 101. l. 9. 'Proof.—Paul,' &c. The accusation brought against the apostle, in the passage under consideration, like some others, is supported by no evidence except that of the pas-

[1] Deut. iii. 23—26.
[2] 1 Sam. xv. 11.
[3] 1 Kings xix. 4.
[4] Rom. vii. 2, 3.

sage itself in Galatians, which it may be proper briefly to consider: "Abraham believed God, and "it was accounted to him for righteousness."[1] This occurred above four hundred years before the giving the law. "Know ye, therefore," says the apostle, "that they who are of faith, the same "are the children of Abraham. And the scripture, "foreseeing that God would justify the heathen "through faith, preached before the gospel unto "Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be "blessed. So then they which be of faith are "blessed with believing Abraham."[2] What is there in this, which either an ancient or a modern Jew can disprove? "But as many," says the apostle, "as are of the works of the law, are under a curse; "for it is written, Cursed is every one that con- "tinueth not in all things which are written in "the book of the law, to do them."[3] All the curses, denounced in the remarkable chapter from which the quotation is made, are against violations, not of the *ritual*, but the *moral* law, which the apostle had principally in view: yet the letter of the several precepts adduced could not possibly involve in the annexed curse any one who was not in the situation, or relation, which it described. The verse, which Mr. C. so severely condemns, is taken from the close of the chapter, and it sums up and seals the whole. It stands in our version, "Cursed is he that confirmeth not *all* the words "of this law, to do them." It may be literally rendered, "Cursed *is he*, who shall not establish

[1] Gen. xv. 6. Gal. iii. 6. [2] Gen. xii. 3. Gal. iii. 7—9.
[3] Deut. xxvii. 26. Gal. iii. 10.

" the words of this law, to do them:" that is, *fully to obey them.* Now suppose any man, in the affairs of this life, should hear it said, by the highest legal authority, concerning any law or code of laws, " Cursed is he who doth not establish the words " of this law, to perform them;" meaning by *cursed,* the penalty denounced against the transgressor: would that man, because the word *all* did not occur, ask the question, Which of the words of this law? And if he did would not the obvious answer be, All the injunctions contained in it? Should he say, I am not a *clergyman,* I cannot obey the law to register baptisms, burials, and marriages; must I fall under the denounced condemnation? I am not an *exciseman,* I cannot obey the law concerning excisemen; must I fall under the condemnation? If we did not think his intellects so far deranged as to render him incapable of attending to an answer, should we not say, You have nothing to do with these laws; nor can have, unless you take on you the office to which they refer. We should also perhaps add, There are many other laws, under which you live, and which are obligatory upon you; and several of these denounce the punishment of death against transgressors: now, if you keep some of these but not *all;* as, for instance, if you do not commit murder, but are guilty of forgery; you will be exposed to this punishment. And, if you keep all for many years, yet at last break only one of them, in one instance, you will become liable to this punishment. There are also many statutes which relate to you in your particular station or profession; and these require likewise your unreserved

and persevering obedience: so that, "if you keep "the whole law, and offend in one point, you are "guilty of all;" and you must continue in all "things written in the book of the law to do them," if you would escape condemnation. Would not this be very plain to the common sense of the most illiterate inquirer? And, if the person addressed had already broken some law and become liable to punishment; would it not be very intelligible, should you inform him that, if he should be dealt with according to the law, he must suffer the denounced punishment; that *the law* could not help him, but he must seek relief from another quarter; even from the clemency of his prince, and from a pardon granted by him? This is precisely the scope of the apostle's argument.

The law of God "is holy, just, and good;" it is "exceedingly broad;" and it is "spiritual," taking cognizance of the heart and secret motives of our conduct. "Thou shalt love the Lord "thy God with all thy heart:" "Thou shalt love "thy neighbour as thyself." These two great commandments comprise, under their most extensive demand, obedience to numerous moral precepts which spring from them; and even to every ritual institution as long as it remains in force. Now "he who doeth these things shall live in "them; but "the soul that sinneth shall die." This is the tenour of the law: if any man hath kept the whole perfectly, and continued in this obedience to the end; the "reward is reckoned to "him as of debt," not of grace. But, if he has once failed in any one particular, in thought, word, or deed, whether by omission or commission; the

condemns him and pronounces him accursed; *grace* alone, or mercy unmerited, and con- y to his merits, can relieve him, rescue him n the condemnation, or give him the reward. her he hath "continued in all things which are ritten in the book of the law to do them," or he n not. If he have failed only in one instance, violating one precept; he has for ever forfeited ie reward of righteousness," according to the , and incurred its awful curse; and the mercy ur King is his only resource. It will no more il him to say that he has kept all the precepts one, than the same plea would in our courts istice avail a traitor: or to say, 'I have kept : one also, except in a single instance;' any e, than for a criminal to say, 'I never com- ted any other crime against the law, but for- y, and that only in one instance.' Still the must bring in the verdict, GUILTY, and the ge must pronounce the awful sentence. He ht indeed add; 'Circumstances are such, that all recommend him to *mercy*:' but *mercy* is from the law; but remits the deserved punish- nt of the law: "Mercy rejoiceth against judg- ent." These considerations made David, say thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquity, who shall and? But there is forgiveness with thee, that ou mayest be feared."[1] "Enter not into dgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified."[2] It might easily be wn that this sentiment pervades the Old Tes- ent, as well as the New: and that all the

[1] Psalm cxxx. 3, 4. [2] Psalm cxliii. 2.

approved characters, from the fall of Adam to the close of the Old Testament, sought acceptance with God as *sinners, from mercy, by faith*; and not by their own obedience to the holy law of God: for had they been entitled to it upon the latter ground, they would not have wanted forgiveness.

The apostle did not intend to shew, that Jews *alone*, who, refusing the proffered mercy of the gospel, continued to be "of the works of the law," were "under the curse;" but that this is, and must be, the case of *all men*; Jews or gentiles, who, having acted in any thing contrary to their known duty, persist, notwithstanding, in justifying themselves, and claim "the reward of righteous-"ness" as a debt, or reward, and not as an unmerited favour. This appears in his subsequent reasoning, which he sums up by saying, "The "scripture hath concluded" (or *shut up together*, συνέκλεισε,) "all under sin; that the promise by "faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them "that believe."[3]

The Galatians in general had been gentiles; but, after their conversion to Christianity, other teachers endeavoured to proselyte them to Judaism; and the apostle fortifies their minds against this temptation, by a chain of conclusive reasoning from the Old Testament, which no man can answer. It is also evident that they had become acquainted with the law of Moses, and were not liable to be imposed on through ignorance. Mr. C. professes to give the whole verse, (p. 99. l. 34.)

[1] Gal. iii. 22.

it is in the Hebrew; but he only gives a part it; and joins his own comment to it, as if it ere a part of the text: 'Which is to say, that he must do and observe all those commandments that he can, and which may be done:'—words vague and ambiguous, that it cannot be known hat ideas they convey.

It does not appear to me that the word *all*, hich the apostle is most severely reprehended r inserting, in the smallest degree alters the eaning of the passage; for, were it omitted, hat difference of sense would arise from it? If loses only meant *some* of the things written in e law; which did he mean to include, and which exclude? Had the apostle said; 'He is under e curse who does not continue in these two ings, "written in the book of the law to do them;" namely, "in loving God with all his heart," and "in loving his neighbour as himself;"' the result would have been precisely e same: but the statement would not have been ually obvious and intelligible to every reader.

P. 99. l. 31. 'For any person that knows the original Hebrew,' &c.—To this I subjoin: 'And, any person understand Greek, and will consult e Septuagint, he will see that what I am about say is true,' namely, that St. Paul quoted the xt as he found it in the Greek translation, *made y Jews*, before the time of our Lord Jesus Christ. e wrote to those who used this Greek translaon; it expressed the original with sufficient actness for his purpose; and he took it as he und it, not indeed *verbatim*, as the learned ader will observe in comparing the texts; but

so far as to take the word *all*, which is here so strongly and severely objected against, from that translation. No doubt he quoted from memory: but the quotation conveys precisely the same meaning as the Septuagint version.

These ancient translators did not mean 'to 'deceive the gentiles,' by inserting the word (πᾶσι) *all:* but, if there were any such intention, the blame belongs to them, not to the apostle; unless any should think that he was to blame, *as a Christian*, for paying so much deference to a translation made *by Jews*.

If Christians adduce this text against the Jews as "under the curse," in any other sense than as other unbelieving and unpardoned sinners are, they misapply it; for that was not the apostle's object in quoting it. He meant to teach all men, both Jews and gentiles, the difference between "the righteousness of faith," and "the righteous-"ness of works;" "the covenant of grace," and 'the covenant of works.' If it be applied exclusively to the Jews by professed Christians, with self-preference and severity, or contempt of the Jews, it is a very *unchristian* conduct.

The word *all*, in the translation of the original text in Deuteronomy,[1] being in Italics, marks that it is not in the Hebrew: and, in my opinion, it would have been better not to have inserted it. Such insertions are, in some cases, necessary to give the meaning in the English idiom: but where not absolutely necessary, they constitute a paraphrase, or a comment, instead of a translation:

[1] Deut. xxvii. 26.

and this would be better avoided, even if it were only to prevent cavils and objections. It is, however, certain that the translators were not influenced by a desire 'to please St. Paul,' (for why should they?) much less 'to give offence to God:' but, in fact, they paid in this, as in some other instances, too great deference to the Septuagint: and, doubtless, their reverence of the apostle's words, as the language of inspiration, induced them the rather to do it. But, if indeed they acted improperly in this, a reproof, even in far milder language than that given by Mr. C. would have come with an ill grace from one, who has himself taken such unwarrantable liberties, in quoting scripture, as have already been pointed out. If, 'in the day of judgment,' the venerable translators of the Bible, have nothing worse than this to answer for; their honest and very able endeavours to give their countrymen the word of God, in their vernacular language, will meet with a gracious recompense.—The word might indeed be well spared; but it does not, in the smallest degree, alter the meaning of the text: and, in conceding thus much respecting our version, in a few instances, I feel as if I needed an apology. *Ubi plurima nitent, non ego paucis offendar maculis.*

P. 100. l. 28. 'Let them,' &c.—It would be well for both Jews, Christians, and gentiles, to "give "the more earnest heed" to the texts of scripture here quoted: but the reader may not at first perceive for what purpose the words of God to Balaam are added. The subsequent paragraph will explain it.

P. 101. l. 10. 'Conclusion.—The blessed,' &c.—God *blessed* Israel, and Balaam wanted to *curse* them; and it is here insinuated that St. Paul, and Christians approving his argument in the text which has been considered,[1] imitate Balaam in this conduct. But neither the apostle, nor his expositors, nor well-informed Christians, so much as attempt to shew that Israel, or unbelieving and disobedient Israelites, are "under the curse," in any other sense than all other unbelievers and impenitent sinners are; or than they themselves were, till "they fled for refuge" to the covenant of grace, the righteousness of faith, and the salvation of the gospel. Yet Moses, or God by Moses, addressing Israelites *exclusively*, both in the chapter from which the text is quoted, and in other places, hath gone much beyond this in pronouncing a *curse* on disobedient Israelites.[2] And, so far was the apostle, and so far are we, from desiring, with Balaam, that Israel should be *cursed*; that it may confidently be said, that even Moses himself did more earnestly desire "that "Israel should be blessed" than the apostle did:[3] and we would zealously endeavour to imitate his example. I am conscious, in the sight of God, that this is my prevailing motive in this publication; and I cannot doubt that it is that of the London Society, and of all its best friends.

But where, in the books of Moses, or in the Old Testament, is the *blessing* engaged to Israel merely as 'having the law given them,' without

[1] Gal. iii. 10.

[2] Deut. xi. 26—28. xxvii. 14—26. xxviii. 15—20. xxix. 19—21.

[3] Ezek. xxxii. 32. Rom. ix. 1—3.

any respect to their obedience or disobedience? In the face, however, of the awful curses on those who broke particular precepts, and did not confirm the law by doing it; as well as many other passages to the same effect; Mr. C. seems to take for granted that the blessing, contained at the close of Moses's prophecy concerning the tribes of Israel,[1] belongs to every individual Israelite and every proselyte, however rebellious and hardened in impenitence! But this subject will again require our notice.—"Keeping the covenant and "mercy to them that love him, and to them that "keep his commandments." This was Daniel's view of the subject.[2]—There are some sentiments, charged on different descriptions of men, which it is very difficult to believe they really maintain. When the apostle expostulates with his countrymen, "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and restest "in the law, and makest thy boast of God; and "knowest his will, and approvest the things that "are more excellent, being instructed out of the "law: and art confident that thou thyself art a "guide of the blind; a light of them which are "in darkness; an instructor of the foolish; a "teacher of babes; who hast the form of know-"ledge, and of the truth in the law. Thou there-"fore which teachest another, teachest thou not "thyself? thou that preachest, A man should not "steal; dost thou steal? thou that sayest, A man "should not commit adultery; dost thou commit "adultery? thou that makest thy boast of the "law; through breaking the law, dishonourest

[1] Deut. xxxiii. 29. [2] Dan. ix. 4. x. 4.

"thou God?"[1] In reading this, I say, it is difficult to conceive, that the apostle could be combating an opponent, who *avowed* such sentiments. It is scarcely credible, that men should "trust in "the law," "boast in God," and keep up that confidence, while guilty of the grossest and most scandalous violations of the law! Yet this was the case in the apostle's days, and in that of the prophets.[2] And we may therefore be the less surprised, at hearing a similar confidence avowed in our days. The words before noticed may perhaps recur to the reader's mind, on this occasion. 'Israel is still Israel;' the same as in ancient days. (P. 79. l. 13.) The gentiles may be saved by *keeping* the precepts of Noah, but Israelites and proselytes by *receiving* the law of Moses.

P. 101. l. 22. 'Question respecting the disper-'sion of Israel.'—P. 102. l. 18. 'To convert all 'the gentile world,' &c.—Then the whole world will at length be converted to the true worship of the only God of Israel. This I believe; and likewise, that the dispersion of Israel will eventually be overruled as one grand means of accomplishing this most blessed object. Mr. C. however, before denied, that this would ever be the case. (P. 89. l. 21.)

P. 103. l. 31. 'In this night was burnt the first 'and second temple.'—This I suppose is learned from tradition, and it may be true for any thing I know to the contrary.

P. 104. l. 20. 'That is, 490 years,' &c.—Daniel's prophecy was delivered nearly seventy years after

[1] Rom. ii. 17—24. [2] Is. xlviii. 1—5. Jer. vii. 7—10

the destruction of the first temple; but this subject has repeatedly been considered.

P. 105. l. 13. 'Spoke with them face to face.'—This was peculiar to Moses; as Mr. C. has before stated.

P. 105. l. 16. 'As for the rest,' &c.—It is not clear how this statement of the oral law being given to Israel, in general, can accord with what went before; p. 94. The oral law, however, is now no secret, for it is 'written in books;' and any man may learn the secret, who has money to purchase, and time and patience to read those books.

P. 105. l. 24. 'Ye shall be to me a kingdom of 'priests.'—It should be noticed, that this was spoken before any part of either law was given.[1]

P. 105. l. 28. 'The ministers,' &c.—When it is clearly stated, what is here meant by the word *ministers*; whether *servants* simply, or *ministers of state*, or *ministers of religion*; it may be requisite to give some answer to the passage. The Israelites in general were not ministers of religion: indeed none of them but the priests of Aaron's family; the Levites, their assistants; and the prophets who were occasionally raised up. And we read in Isaiah, concerning the gentiles, "I "will also take of them for priests and Levites, "saith the Lord."[2] The words of Malachi also are of great importance in this argument. Speaking to the priests, he says, "Who is there even "among you that would shut the doors for "nought? Neither do ye kindle a fire on my "altar for nought. I have no pleasure in you,

[1] Ex. xix. 6. [2] Is. lxvi. 19—21.

" saith the Lord of hosts; neither will I accept " an offering at your hand. For, from the rising " of the sun to the going down thereof, my name " shall be great among the gentiles; and in every " place incense shall be offered unto my name, " and a pure offering: for my name shall be great " among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts."[1]— But perhaps the word is used in some other sense. No doubt, Israel has been very honourably distinguished among the nations of the earth: but, alas! that people has been as much distinguished by rebellion against God, and persecution of his true ministers, even his holy prophets, as by external privileges. It is, however, cordially allowed, that converted and restored Israel will have a high prëeminence among the Christian nations of the earth. I fully believe, that they will have all that distinguished honour among the nations, which a spiritual mind would be even willing to accept: and that they will cease to desire that domination over other men, to which they now aspire. But when " all the ends of the earth shall remember " themselves, and turn unto the Lord; and all the " kindreds of the nations shall worship before " him;" are these unnumbered millions to have no spiritual pastors and teachers? or none but Israelites? If this is to be the case, a new and more extensive, though more honourable, dispersion of Israel must take place, than any which has ever yet occurred.

P. 106. l. 8. 'Idolatry taken away from Israel.' —L.20. 'If Idolatry had not been taken,' &c.—

[1] Mal. i. 10, 11.

I believe this remark to be just and well grounded, and that this has not been sufficiently noted by writers on these subjects. How for this adherence to the true God has been, and is, that of knowledge, faith, love, and spiritual worship, is another question; respecting which, it cannot be supposed that Jews and Christians should be of the same sentiments.

P. 106. l. 30. 'All of them,' &c.—In what sense and how far this was true, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the prophecies of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and the histories of Josephus, as well as the New Testament, best explain: but a melancholy conclusion must be deduced from their combined testimony.

P. 106. l. 34. 'To begin their ministry.'—It was certainly a most inauspicious beginning; and the progress and success have hitherto been according to it: but something far better may speedily be expected.

P. 107. l. 10. 'You shall go abroad and make 'an atonement,' &c.—Where do we learn from Moses, or the prophets, or any part of the Old Testament, that *atonement* could be made, except either by the condign punishment of the criminals, or by the sacrificing of innocent animals; the shedding and sprinkling of blood; the *death of the innocent for the guilty*, according to the rites of the law? The apostle states the fact, and his words cannot be disproved: "Almost all things "are by the law purged with blood; and without "shedding of blood is no remission."[1]

[1] Heb. ix. 22.

Moses indeed says, after the sin of Israel in making the golden calf, "Peradventure, I shall "make an atonement for your sin. And Moses "returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh, this people "have sinned a great sin, and have made them "gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt forgive "their sin; and, if not, blot me, I pray thee, out "of thy book which thou hast written. And the "Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned "against me, him will I blot out of my book."[1] As if he had said, 'O Lord, instead of destroying 'Israel as a sacrifice to thy justice; let me be the 'sacrifice, and spare them.' The answer of God seems to imply, that this was his meaning; and that by this disinterested proposal he hoped to make an *atonement:* but it could not be acceded to. Phinehas also "made an atonement for the "children of Israel," that is, by the condign punishment of the daring criminals.[2] "He executed "judgment, and so the plague was stayed."[3]

P. 107. l. 19. 'All those families,' &c.—I doubt not that individuals and nations have suffered, and will suffer, severe punishment, for their cruel oppression of Israel. But Jews should remember, that their ancestors shed the blood of their own prophets and righteous men, and were the most sanguinary persecutors of Christians. All parties are deeply criminal: may God give all, concerned in this hateful work, true repentance and forgiveness; and teach them that, forgiving one another, they may henceforth only "strive together in love "and good works." Surely, however, those who

[1] Exod. xxxii. 30—33. [2] Num. xxv. 13. [3] Psalm cvi. 30.

shall be the friends and helpers of Israel at their restoration, will not be involved in the vengeance inflicted on their obstinate enemies.

P. 107. l. 28. 'One bushel of fine wheat,' &c.—Moses and the prophets give a far different view of the nation.[1] Israel, before he is restored, must be humbled, and made "to loathe and abhor "himself; and to acknowledge, that God hath "wrought with him for his own name's sake, and "not according to his evil deeds;" otherwise he would have been utterly consumed. Till the Jews cease to boast and be "haughty, because of "their holy mountain" and their special distinctions, their dispersion will continue. But, when God shall "pour out upon them the spirit "of grace and supplication," they will use a far different language.[2] "That thou mayest remem-"ber, and be confounded, and never open thy "mouth any more for thy shame; when I am "pacified toward thee, for all that thou hast done, "saith the Lord."[3] "For I will take you from "among the heathen, and gather you out of all "countries, and will bring you into your own "land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon "you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthi-"ness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new "spirit will I put within you; and I will take "away the stony heart out of your flesh, and will "give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my "Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my

[1] Deut. xxxi. 16—18. xxxii. 21—28. Amos ix. 1—10.
[2] Zeph. iii. 11. Zech. xii. 10. [3] Ezek. xvi. 63.

" statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and " do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I " gave unto your fathers; and ye shall be my " people, and I will be your God."—" Then shall " ye remember your own evil ways, and your " doings that were not good; and *shall loathe* " *yourselves* in your own sight for your iniquities, " and for your abominations. Not for your sakes " do I this, saith the Lord God, be it known unto " you. Be ashamed and confounded, for your " own ways, O house of Israel." [1] From prophecies of this kind we learn 'the restoration of Israel:' and we also learn what restored Israel will think and say concerning their own character and conduct, and those of their ancestors from age to age.

P. 107. l. 34. 'This people have I formed for 'myself; they shall shew forth my praise, *but not* '*the gentiles*.'—Any one, not acquainted with the writings of Isaiah, would suppose that the concluding clause was quoted along with the rest from him; and marked with Italics, to put additional emphasis on it: but it is in fact Mr. C.'s addition to Isaiah's words; which has no ground to rest on either in the passage quoted from the prophet, or in any part of the scripture. " Praise " the Lord, all ye nations, praise him all ye " people." [2] " Sing to the Lord a new song, and " his praise from the ends of the earth; ye that " go down to the sea, and all that is therein; the " isles and the inhabitants thereof. Let the wil- " derness and the cities thereof lift up their voice,

[1] Ezek. xxxvi. 24—32. [2] Psalm cxvii. 1.

"the villages that Kedar doth inhabit. Let the "inhabitants of the rock sing; let them shout "from the top of the mountains. Let them give "glory unto the Lord, and declare his praise "in the islands."[1] Do Israelites exclusively inhabit "the isles of the sea," and "the villages of "Kedar?"

P. 108. l. 23. 'But now no excuse,' &c.—Mr. C. sees the propriety of leaving the gentiles "without "excuse;" and it would be well if he were fully aware that Israel is, and will be, without excuse also at the great day of God. The apostle has proved that both gentiles and Jews are without excuse; and "that every mouth shall be stopped, "and all the world become guilty before God."[2] Here at least is impartiality in the charge or verdict.—It must, alas, be added, that the conduct and character of Israel, throughout their dispersions, has not been generally suited to produce the conviction, that they are the true people of God, and their's the true religion. This is intimated by the prophet: "And ye shall behold "their ways and their doings; and ye shall be "comforted concerning all the evil which I have "brought upon Jerusalem. And they shall com-"fort you, when ye see their ways and their "doings: and ye shall know that I have not "done without cause all that I have done in it, "saith the Lord God."[3] "And I scattered them "among the heathen, and they were dispersed "through the countries: according to their way,

[1] Is. xlii. 10—12. [2] Rom. i. 20. ii. 1. iii. 9—20.
[3] Ezek. xiv. 22, 23.

" and according to their doings, I judged them. " And, when they entered among the heathen " whither they went, they profaned my holy name, " when they said to them, These are the people " of JEHOVAH, and are gone forth out of their " land."[1]

P. 109. l. 11. 'They preached wonderful ser-'mons,' &c. The 'wonderful sermons,' which will be made effectually successful in the conversion of the gentiles, have not yet been preached by dispersed Israel. We, however, confidently expect that they will be ere long; and that their conversion to their long rejected Messiah, accomplishing, after so astonishing a manner, the prophecies of scripture respecting the nation, will be " as life from the dead," to the world at large.— But the 'wonderful sermons' here intended, are of a widely different nature. " Fifteen hundred of " them took knives, and stabbed their wives and " children, &c." (L. 18, 19.) Was this done according to the law of God, or directly contrary to it? Was it not atrocious *murder*, rebellion, and desperation? Was it suited to convince the persecutors, that they, the Jews, were the true " people of God?" Was it not calculated to fill them with abhorrence of both them and their religion? Let any man compare it with the mild, dignified, and firm conduct of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, when the fiery furnace was before their eyes: or with that of Daniel, in the prospect of the lions' den: or with that of Jeremiah in the

[1] Ez. xxxvi. 19—21. See also Deut. xxix. 22—28. 1 Kings ix. 6—9. Jer. xl. 1—3. Lam. iv. 13—16.

hands of his persecutors:[1] or even with that of the Maccabees, under the cruel persecutions of Antiochus: and let him ask himself, Which was more consonant to the command of God, or suited to produce a favourable impression on the beholders? The conduct of the wretched Jews was indeed a fulfilment of the words of Moses: "Thou "shalt be mad for the sight of thine eyes, which "thou shalt see."[2]—I do not mean to palliate the conduct of those detestable wretches who drove the poor Jews to this madness and desperation.[3] It was hateful beyond expression.

P. 109. l. 26. 'They must have a good reason,' &c.—Can any man have a *good* reason for committing the most atrocious complicated murder of the nearest relatives, and closing the horrid scene with suicide? The persecuted saints, from Abel to the close of the Old Testament, neither murdered themselves nor others; but meekly and patiently adhered to the Lord; leaving to their persecutors exclusively the guilt of the murders committed by them. If the Jews never preach other sermons than these 'shocking sermons,' no good effect on the nations will follow: but, when they become the lowly disciples of him, "who was led as a lamb to the "slaughter, and as a sheep before his shearers "was dumb;" he will teach them other lessons, and they will preach far other sermons. Then indeed, "the remnant of Jacob shall be in the "midst of many people, as the dew from the Lord, "as the showers on the grass, that tarrieth not for

[1] Dan. iii. 16—18. vi. 10—23. Jer. xxvi. 12—15.
[2] Deut. xxviii. 32—34. [3] Ec. vii. 7..

" man, nor waiteth for the sons of men."[1] Then also the prophecy of Zechariah, will receive a far more full accomplishment, than it has hitherto done.[2] (P. 110. l. 11—18.)

P. 111. l. 4. 'Christians boast very much about 'this new law.'—It may be confidently said, that, if any called Christians do indeed thus boast very much of a new law, they know little or nothing of the real nature of Christianity; as both their *boasting*, and their language about a *new law*, shew. We desire to induce Israel to look unto Him, " who is the end of the law for righteousness " unto every one that believeth."

P. 111. l. 6. 'Their new law permits them,' &c. Certainly no law of God warrants Christians to murder Jews; any more than any law of God warranted the fifteen hundred Jews to murder their wives and children and themselves. So far from it, that Christianity requires us to do all the good in our power, even to the Jew who would persecute and destroy us, if such there now be.

P. 111. l. 22. 'Perhaps,' &c.—They who have murdered or injured the Jews will, unless truly penitent, suffer condign punishment. We, indeed, who have never *personally*, either committed this atrocious crime, or approved it in others, cannot 'repay the blood of Israel:' but we would " do " what we can:" and we desire, by way of compensation of past injuries from men called Christians, to treat Israel with all candour, benevolence, and compassion; and to pay some little of the immense debt which we acknowledge ourselves to

[1] Mic. v. 7. [2] Zech. viii. 20—23.

owe to their progenitors, through whom we enjoy all our invaluable blessings. This exclusively is the object of the London Society.

P. 111. l. 25. 'A way,' &c.—It must also be allowed, that immense injustice has been done to the Jews by slanders and false accusations, which, in many cases, are as pernicious and cruel as more direct murder: but it would be well if the Jews would endeavour to refute these by a strict adherence to equity, truth, and mercy. However *guilty* their revilers, I fear the epithet *innocent* does not belong to the Jews: and I would simply ask, has nothing in the conduct of the Jews given even *plausibility* to these calumnies? I do not ask this, to excuse, in any degree the *calumniators*; but to suggest an useful hint to the *calumniated*. —We ought not to speak to the injury of others, even what we know to be true, unless we have some good reason for doing it.

P. 112. l. 10. 'The title of Israel.'—The word *title* is not scriptural, nor does the import of it clearly appear: but I suppose it means the *right* and *title* to temporal dominion over the nations. The texts, however, afterwards adduced, (p. 112—114,) speak nothing concerning this *right* or *title*; but merely state, that God will no more disannul or violate his covenant with Israel, than he will terminate or alter the ordinances of the sun and moon.

P. 112. l. 12. 'No Israel, no world.'—It is both scriptural and reasonable to maintain, that all things in creation and providence have been so ordered and constituted, as to forward the eternal good of all the spiritual worshippers and holy ser-

vants of God;[1] in subserviency to the display of his glorious perfections, and the interests of true religion. But that all things, relating to the immense multitudes of those who have hitherto inhabited, or shall hereafter inhabit, this globe, without any distinction of character and conduct, should be as nothing in the view of their common Creator, except as the temporal aggrandisement of one small nation, often most wicked, rebellious, and ungrateful is concerned: this is wholly unscriptural and unreasonable, nay even monstrous!

P. 112. l. 28. 'Israel, who observes the cove-'nant,' &c.—But what becomes of that very large part of Israel which does not 'observe the cove-'nant of God?'—"Which my covenant they "brake." "They have transgressed the laws, "changed the ordinances, broken the everlasting "covenant."[2] This is the very thing on which we insist.—"Truly God is good to Israel, even to "such as are of a clean heart."[3] We consider none of the descendents of Abraham as a part of the *true* Israel, except those who inherit his obedient faith: and we believe the promises to be made to them exclusively, and not to include all those who, from age to age, have lived and died unbelieving, disobedient, impenitent, unconverted rebels and enemies. It is true that, taught by the New Testament, we consider the nation of Israel as a kind of type of the true Israel; namely of all, whether of the race of Israel or of gentile extraction, who are the believing, obedient, and spiritual

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 21—23. 2 Cor. iv. 15. [2] Is. xxiv. 5.
[3] Ps. lxxiii. 1.

servants and worshippers of the God of Abraham. The apostle expresses our views of this subject, when he says of Abraham, "He received the sign "of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of "the faith which he had, yet being uncircum-"cised; that he may be the father of all them that "believe, though they be not circumcised; that "righteousness might be imputed unto them also: "and the father of circumcision to them who are "not of the circumcision only, but who also walk "in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, "which he had being yet uncircumcised."[1] Some proof, that the term Israel admits of this application, might be adduced even from the Old Testament; but as it is peculiarly the doctrine of the New Testament, it is not to be expected that Jews will receive it; and this hint shall here be urged no further.

P. 112. l. 32. 'Rachel is called the moon,' &c.—Rachel was dead before Joseph had this dream: but, whoever was spoken of, their doing obeisance to Joseph, not others doing obeisance to them, was evidently meant.[2]

P. 113. l. 9. 'Moses divided the sea,' &c.—Jesus "walked on the sea," and he "commanded "the winds and the waves and they obeyed him." The texts adduced, (l. 9—24.) however, only prove that some individuals in Israel wrought miracles, which no Christian denies. 'But miracles 'are a poor and miserable defence,' &c: (p. 41. l. 10.) It seems, when miracles are wrought *for* Israel, or *by* Israel, 'the case is altered.'

[1] Rom. iv. 11, 12. [2] Gen. xxxv. 15—20. xxxvii. 9, 10.

P. 113. l. 22. 'Angels are not called the sons of 'God,' &c.—"When the morning-stars sang toge-" ther, and all the sons of God shouted for joy."[1]

P. 113. l. 25. 'We do not find,' &c.—Angels did not, and could not need the ministry of Israel, and Israel had no power of ministering to angels: but an angel ministered unto Hagar, who was not of Israel.[2] Angels brought Lot, who was not of Israel, out of Sodom.[3] An angel also instructed Eliphaz.[4]

P. 114. l. 9. 'Erellim,' &c.—Rather *Erallam*, as the Masorites have properly pointed it. The word occurs in two places, and no more, and is translated "*lion-like men*."[5] The word, rendered here *angels*, means *messengers*, or ambassadors. When Sennacherib invaded Judah, Hezekiah's *lion-like men* cried out; and the ambassadors, whom he sent to meet Rabshakeh and treat about peace, returned with their clothes rent, and no doubt with bitter lamentations over the deplorable condition of their country. The idea of angels *mourning and weeping* has no support in scripture, nor is it at all reasonable in itself.

P. 114. l. 19. 'The title of the gentiles,—l. 28. "All nations before him are as nothing," &c.[6]—Is it here meant, that in this respect Israel is an exception to this general rule? The other texts, quoted in this paragraph, are parts of distinct prophecies: the first and second, of the destruction of Sennacherib's army; and the fourth, of the vengeance of God on Edom. Probably, in this,

[1] Job. xxxviii. 6, 7. [2] Gen. xvi. 6—14. xxi. 17—19
[3] Gen. xix. 1—22. [4] Job iv. 12—21.
[5] 2 Sam. xxiii. 20. 1 Chron. xi. 22. [6] Is. xl. 17.

the enemies of the people of God are designated under a general name, and future events are also predicted: but by the same rule of interpretation, all the friends, the spiritual worshippers, and believing servants of God, are designated by the name Israel.—The texts prove nothing in the main argument.

P. 115. l. 3. 'The last fortune of the gentiles.' —The word *fortune*, in this application, is objectionable, as it has already been shewn.

P. 115. l. 6. 'Will they not acknowledge,' &c. —Certainly all the evil, and all the good likewise, which God has predicted concerning the nations, and concerning Israel, shall be accomplished. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but his word "shall not pass away." It only remains to be shewn, what evil, and what good, is predicted respecting the gentiles and concerning Israel: for *Christians* are not required to acknowledge, that all the conclusions of *Jews*, concerning these predictions, are well grounded.

P. 115. l. 9. 'It is now 1744,' &c.—This is more accurate, than the preceding calculation, but not so well suited to complete the seventy jubilees. (P. 88.)

P. 115. l. 13. 'King David, when he saw,' &c. —It is not said, in the title, that the forty-fourth Psalm was written by David; and indeed it is highly improbable. Mr. C. applies it to the present dispersions of the Jews; the apostle quotes it, concerning the persecutions of the Christian church.[1] The following words, "All this is come

[1] Rom. viii. 36.

" upon us; yet have we not forgotten thee, neither " have we dealt falsely in thy covenant: our heart " is not turned back, neither have our steps de- " clined from thy ways:"[1] seem to render it inapplicable, either to the Babylonish captivity, or the present dispersion of Israel. The whole, indeed, is far more suited to the situation of a company suffering "persecution for righteousness' " sake," than to any people enduring miseries as the punishment or chastening for their sins.[2] If, however, the Jews think this applicable to their case, during the 1744 years spoken of, because they have not been guilty of gross idolatry, it would answer little purpose to contest the point. When God shall "pour on them the Spirit of " grace and supplications," they will see the matter in another light.

The passage, quoted from the apostle Paul, refers entirely to the final judgment of the world, and the eternal state of individuals; and to the precedency "in tribulation and anguish" of wicked Jews over wicked Gentiles.[3]

P. 115. l. 34. 'Do they imagine,' &c?—The Messiah will forgive either his crucifiers, or the persecutors of his people, whenever they truly repent, and seek forgiveness *from him*. But he will not forgive either Jew or gentile, who does not repent and seek mercy.[4]—I am sorry to add, that such remarks betray a vindictive spirit in the writer; who, it is evident, judges of the Messiah's conduct from his own *feelings*. I make this re-

[1] Ps. xliv. 16—18.
[2] Ver. 20—22.
[3] Rom. ii. 9—16.
[4] Ezek. xviii. 30—32.

mark with reluctance, but it must not be repressed. —'The Messiah forgive.' (See on P. 17.)

P. 116. l. 3. 'The blood of Israel cries,' &c.—This 'blood of Israel' includes the blood of the prophets and righteous men shed by the ancient Jews and Israelites; the blood of Stephen, of James, of other apostles, and many other martyrs, as well as the blood of Israel shed by the gentiles: yea, it includes the blood of Jesus himself. But "his blood speaketh better things than that of "Abel," which cried for vengeance on him who shed it.[1] No doubt the time cometh, when the earth "shall disclose her blood, and no more cover "her slain."[2] Then the blood of Israel, shed by gentiles, and the blood of Israelites and Christians, shed by Jews, will alike meet condign punishment on all the impenitent and unbelieving; but not on those who repent and flee for refuge to that God, to whom "belong mercies and forgivenesses, "though we have rebelled against him." The cry of blood for vengeance is not peculiar to that of Israel shed by gentiles, but is equally spoken of blood shed in murder, to whatever nation the murdered person or the murderer belonged.[3]

P. 116. l. 4. 'And here,' &c.—No Christian doubts, that "tribulation and anguish" shall come on impenitent workers of iniquity, whether Jew or Gentile: but 'our own apostle' (l. 4, 5.) spoke not of this present world, but of the "day, when "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus "Christ."[4]

[1] Heb. xii. 24. Gen. iv. 10.
[2] Is. xxvi. 21
[3] Gen. ix. 5, 6.
[4] Rom. ii. 9—16.

P. 116. l. 13. 'It is not said, "Rejoice, O all ye 'nations,"' &c.—Supposing that only *some* of the nations were meant, how does it appear that these were "exclusively those nations which never "troubled Israel?" (l. 16.) Moses says no such thing; nor do any of the prophets. It is however a concession of importance, to allow that some nations will rejoice with Israel. "Thus saith the "Lord against all mine evil neighbours, that "touch the inheritance which I have caused my "people Israel to inherit; Behold I will *pluck* "them out of their land, and pluck the house of "Judah from among them. And it shall come "to pass, that, after I have plucked them out, *I* "*will return and have compassion on them*, and "will bring them again every man to his heritage, "and every man to his land. And it shall come "to pass, that, if they will diligently learn the "ways of my people, to swear by my name; as "they have taught my people to swear by Baal; "they shall be built up in the midst of my "people."[1] "In that day shall Israel be the "third with Egypt and Assyria, even a blessing "in the midst of the land; whom the Lord of "hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my "people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and "Israel mine inheritance."[2] Did Egypt and Assyria never trouble Israel?—The word *all*, however, is added in many similar predictions.[3] It is undeniable, from these prophecies, that some

[1] Jer. xii. 14—17. [2] Is. xix. 23—25.

[3] Gen. xviii. 18. xxii. 18. Psalm xxii. 27. lxvii. 2. lxxii. 17. lxxxvi. 9. cxvii. 1. Is. ii. 2. xxv. 7.

nations, even of those who have injured and oppressed Israel, shall be built up in the midst of Israel, and rejoice with them.

P. 116. l. 21. 'Whoever shall be,' &c.—This question has already been considered: but the Jews would do well to inquire very seriously and impartially, whether the former part of the prophecy, here quoted from the second Psalm, was not fulfilled in the events to which the apostles referred it. "Of a truth against thy holy child" (or *Son*, Παιδα) "Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, "both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the gentiles "and the people of Israel, were gathered together; "for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel "determined before to be done."[1] No doubt the Messiah hath crushed and will break, as a potter's vessel is broken with an iron rod, all nations which persist in opposition to him: but, if there would be no mercy for those who submit to him, why was it added, "Be wise now therefore, O ye "kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth: "Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with "trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and "so ye perish from the way; when his wrath is "kindled, yea, but a little, blessed are ALL they "that put their trust in him."[2]

P. 117. l. 1. 'Conqueror of the world,' &c.—This title of the Messiah is not found in scripture, but doubtless he is and will be 'the Conqueror of 'the world:' and all must either bow to the sceptre of his grace, or be broken by his iron rod. "He must reign till he hath put all enemies under

[1] Acts iv. 25—28. [2] Ps. ii. 20—12.

" his feet."[1] If the Jews have no enemies but the gentiles; and if the Messiah and his people have no other enemies than human beings of whatever nation; this might be specious. But we consider this evil world, sin, Satan, and death, as especially those enemies, from which the Messiah delivers all his people: and we are firmly of opinion that Zechariah had these enemies especially in view, when he said, " That he would " grant unto us, that we, being saved from the " hand of our enemies, might serve him, without " fear, in holiness and righteousness, before him " all the days of our life."[2] We are, however, very willing to allow, that the Messiah will save Israel from all their gentile enemies: but to be *saved from them* is one thing; to be *avenged on them*, or to *exercise lordly dominion over them*, is another thing. " When a man's ways please the " Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace " with him."[3] And if God so influence the minds of the nations, that, instead of hating and injuring Israel, they should vie with each other in expressions of love and gratitude to Israel; and in rendering them all the honour which either reason or scripture can admit to be desirable; one would think it must be as desirable a deliverance, to any but an incurably vindictive and ambitious mind, as the destruction or absolute subjugation of the gentiles. I think I can answer for tens of thousands in this land, of us poor " sinners of the " gentiles," that we feel no enmity to Israel, no,

[1] Psalm cx. 1. 1 Cor. xv. 25—27. [2] Luke i. 71—75.
[3] Prov. xvi. 7.

not to the most hostile Jew; but simply goodwill and compassion; that we seldom forget to pray earnestly for them, according to our views of what would be a blessing to them; and that we could receive no higher gratification, than to welcome the Jews as our brethren in Christ, and partakers of all our advantages. These feelings concerning this dispersed and cruelly oppressed people, I am happy to say, are getting ground rapidly among Christians. May the Lord increase them more and more!

P. 117. l. 12. 'This is also confirmed,' &c.—I am of opinion, that the *short* and *inadequate* contents, at the head of each chapter in the common editions of the Bible, would be far better omitted. Certainly, in the instance adduced, a very wrong view is given of the chapter. The title, as it stands in the quarto Oxford Bible, 1731, runs thus: 'The land of Israel is comforted, 'both by the destruction of the heathen, who 'spitefully used it; and by the blessings of God 'promised unto it. Israel was rejected for their '*sin*; and shall be restored without their *desert*. 'The blessings of Christ's kingdom.' I suppose that the contents, as annexed by the venerable translators, are contained in the large Bibles, with marginal readings; but I do not know who abridged them for the smaller editions. It seems, however, to have been done with little judgment. At any rate these contents are simply *a comment*: and I would, with great deference, as speaking of a Society, which I especially admire and honour, suggest the hint, to the conductors of the British and Foreign Bible Society, should this fall into

the hands of any of them, that the retaining of these contents is a deviation from their grand and most important rule of distributing the scriptures 'without note and comment.' The instance here adduced (to which I could easily add very many more,) shews, that the abridged contents sometimes are a highly erroneous comment on the sacred text.

P. 117. l. 17. 'Question.' There is not much argument in the close of these questions. 'Israel 'hath lost all these things,' &c. (l. 24.) But why cannot God give them all these things, and all other temporal and providential benefits, in the same way in which he delivered their ancestors and settled them in Canaan? or as he has given them to the gentiles, without a Messiah?

We "sinners of the gentiles" want a Messiah to save us from the deserved wrath of God, from the "curse of his law," by enduring it himself; from "the wrath to come;" from our "sins;" "from this present evil world;" from "death, "and him that hath the power of death, that is, "the devil:" we need to be "saved in the Lord "with an everlasting salvation;" to have "our "sins subdued, and cast into the depths of the "sea." We need a Messiah who, "by the know-"ledge of him, shall justify many, for he shall "bear their iniquities;" who shall be "a light to "the gentiles," and "the salvation of God to the "ends of the earth." Deliverance from sin, and all its consequences; reconciliation to God and recovery to holiness; supports and comforts in our souls, while passing through this vale of tears; hope and exultation in death; and everlasting

happiness in another world; are the blessings which we gentiles desire from the Messiah. And all who feel their need of them, and desire them, know that they can be found in no other. Millions, very many millions, have already received these blessings, by faith in Jesus Christ; and increasing numbers shall receive them, till "all nations shall "be blessed in him." Having this salvation, the *spiritual* mind desires no more: but "the *carnal* "mind," (which prefers, and values as the best things, those temporal advantages which are enumerated in the questions under consideration,) "is death," and "enmity against God." Were we satisfied to enjoy these blessings ourselves, and did we care nothing about the eternal salvation of the Jews; did we not "count it more "blessed to give than to receive;" and long to communicate *our* good things, *infinitely* good things, to them, rather than to share their transient imaginary good things; (which most of the present generation must, at any rate, come short of:) we should leave the Jews to their dream of kings, of lands, of nobles, and riches, and glory; and should never think of advancing a claim, or entering into a competition about them. For we are not only fully convinced, that such a Messiah, bringing a redemption of this kind, will never come; but also that, if such a one did come, the satisfaction arising from his coming would be "as "the dream of a night-vision. It shall even be "as when a hungry man dreameth that he eateth; "but he awaketh, and his soul is empty; or as "when a thirsty man dreameth, and behold he "drinketh; but he awaketh, and behold he is

"faint, and his soul hath appetite."[1] "Vanity of "vanities, saith the preacher, vanity of vanities, "all is vanity."[2]

If the Jews wanted a Messiah only for such purposes as are stated in these questions; it would be comparatively a small matter, should all future generations of Israel live and die, as all former generations have lived and died, without a Messiah. But we "sinners of the gentiles," being the race of fallen Adam, ourselves also being disposed to imitate him, having in numberless instances actually copied his example of ingratitude, apostacy, and rebellion; and being thus involved in his condemnation: we, knowing that "it is appointed to men once to die, and after "death the judgment;" and that "in the sight "of God shall no man living be justified;"[3] need a Redeemer and Saviour from the wrath of God, from the curse of his violated law, from the power of the devil, from our own sinful propensities and habits, "and from this evil world." We want an *atonement*, which can satisfy the Divine justice, and render it honourable to an infinitely holy and just God to pardon our sins; and one "to bring "in an everlasting righteousness," "for our jus- "tification." We stand in urgent need of an Advocate and Mediator to "appear in the presence "of God for us," to render our prayers and services acceptable to him. We want a mercy-seat, and a High Priest before that mercy-seat; "a "priest upon his throne," who, being "Lord of "all," may render, by his power, the sacrifice of

[1] Is. xxix. 7, 8. [2] Eccl. i. 2. [3] Psalm cxliii. 2.

his death, and his intercession, as risen and ascended, effectual "to redeem us from all ini-"quity," and to "save us from our sins." We need a Saviour who can "pour upon us the "Holy Spirit" to renew us unto holiness, and make us, who are in ourselves "vessels of wrath "fitted for destruction," to become "vessels of "mercy prepared for eternal glory." In short we need a Messiah, who "is able to save to the "uttermost all who come to God through him;" to receive our souls at death, to raise our bodies, incorruptible and glorious, at the resurrection; to silence all accusers at the day of judgment; and to put us in full possession of everlasting glory and felicity.

We are also deeply convinced that the Jews equally want such a Messiah. "The whole, "indeed, need not a physician:" the wise, strong, righteous, and holy, the *perfectly* righteous and holy, need not such a Redeemer. Yet there is vast danger of deception in this matter, through the excessive self-flattery of the human heart; which is "deceitful above all things," as well as "desperately wicked." "There is a way, that "seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof "are the ways of death."[1] And we consider the words of our Lord to the Laodiceans fairly applicable to this case: "Because thou sayest, I am "rich and increased with goods, and have need "of nothing; and knowest not that thou art "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, "and naked; I counsel thee to buy of me gold

[1] Prov. xvi. 25. Jer. xvii. 9.

" tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich, and " white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and " that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; " and anoint thine eyes with eye-salve, that thou " mayest see."[1] But we have no occasion to refer to the New Testament: the ancient prophets often give similar warnings and counsels.[2]

P. 117. l. 26. 'The punishment,' &c.—I do not think that *all* these quotations from the prophets bear upon the case of Israel, as a nation: but I shall not contest that matter: especially as the main argument, about Jesus of Nazareth being the Messiah, is not much concerned. I agree with the writer, that God hath severely punished the heathen who have injured offending Israel; that he will do the same to their future oppressors; and that he will execute dreadful judgments on those who combine to oppose Israel, when he shall restore that people. But I contend that all, both nations and individuals, who repent of former injuries, and concur in God's purposes of mercy to Israel; and all who, at length renouncing their enmity, shall be cordially reconciled to converted Israel, and disposed to love and honour them, will share Israel's blessedness; and thus that their restoration " shall be as life from " the dead" to the whole earth. This I suppose will be the case of all nations during the Millennium.

P. 119. l. 15. 'By Ezekiel.' Chapter xxxii.—This chapter seems to be wholly unconnected with the subject. Nothing is said in it of the fate

[1] Rev. iii. 17, 18. [2] Jer. ii. 23—35. Hos. xiv. 1, 2.

of 'all nations,' but merely of several nations mentioned by name: as Ashur, Elam, Meshech, Tubal, Edom, and the Zidonians. This emphatical word *all*, which Mr. C. so severely blames the apostle and our translators for adding, is here introduced by him without any warrant.

P. 120. l. 10.—Mr. C. explains several of these prophecies nearly as some modern Christian writers have done. The *outline* of the plan is indeed probable; though the wonderful changes which perpetually take place, during these eventful times, blot and deface, from time to time, every attempt to fill up that *outline*. I do not, however, mean to commit myself as attempting to prophesy from the prophecies: it suffices to observe, that the Messiah is not once mentioned in any one of them. Indeed it seems throughout taken for granted that he is already come, but that neither Israel, nor the nations at large, have hitherto received him and submitted to him: and that very much violent opposition will yet be made to the establishment of his kingdom throughout the earth; but that all opposition shall be eventually overcome and terminated.

P. 121. l. 13. 'Circumcised.'—The word, *circumcised*, does not occur, in any of the prophecies quoted, or referred to, in the whole passage: though "uncircumcised" does in the thirty-second of Ezekiel. This inaccuracy is, however, of no consequence, except as it leads to an acknowledgment that the Mohammedans are circumcised. As these are computed to be more numerous than Christians; and as circumcision is 'the GREAT SEAL' of Israel; there are very many

competitors with Israel for the honour of this external distinction. (P. 29: p. 78. l. 33.)

P. 121. l. 33. 'Messiah, son of Joseph.'—Hosea says nothing of 'Messiah, son of Joseph,'—Judah and Israel shall have "*one* Head," and not *two*. But tradition, I suppose, contradicts the words of Hosea.—Sennacherib carried the Israelites captive in the fourth year of Hezekiah; and ten years after, in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, "he "came up against all the fenced cities of Judah, "and took them."[1] Does this prove, that 'a great 'part of Judah went into captivity *with the* 'Israelites?'

P. 122. l. 11. 'We read in Joshua,' &c.—Is then the tenth of Joshua a *prophecy*, and not a *history*? or is it both a history and a prophecy?

P. 122. l. 18. 'Battle of Gog.'—Concerning the battle of Gog we are agreed: but it has been stated, that the closing verses of the second chapter of Joel relate to other events, even to the awful destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

P. 122. l. 26. 'And I will shew,' &c.—The prophecy in the third chapter of Joel coincides with the prediction of Gog and Magog by Ezekiel, but includes, also, as it appears to me, other events which will occur about the same time.

P. 122. l. 30. 'Boasting of the gentiles.'—The apostle warned the gentile converts at Rome on this subject: "Boast not against the branches; "but, if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but "the root thee." "Be not high-minded, but fear."[2] But, in the course of my reading, I have met with

[1] 2 Kings xviii. 9—13. [2] Romans xi. 18—20.

very little boasting of the gentiles over Israel; not so much, in the whole, as there is boasting of the Jews in this one small tract.—The truth is this: the gentiles, including the bulk of *nominal* Christians, think very little about such matters; and, whatever else they boast of and glory in, it never comes in their way to boast or glory over the Jews, about the dominion under the reign of Messiah. And *true* Christians, by the same train of serious reflection, in which the comparative situations of the Jews and gentiles are brought to their thoughts, learn humility, gratitude, and compassion. They consider all "boasting" over others as extremely *wicked*; and, in proportion as they think themselves favoured above others, they acknowledge their own unworthiness, give the whole glory to God, who alone hath made the difference, and pray for those whom they look on as less favoured. And not only so: but they do what they can to impart their peculiar advantages to them also.

P. 123. l. 2. 'Restoration of Judah and Benja-'min,' &c. L. 8. 'The gentiles would pay no at-'tention,' &c.—The reader must observe, without my noticing it, that Mr. C. wavers on this subject; and sometimes seems to speak of the gentiles as brought to worship God by the Jews, and sometimes as wholly neglecting the instructions given them. The text, however, here adduced, proves nothing in this respect; as it only means, that every people will have regard to that object of worship which they acknowledge as their god; but not that they will never "turn from idols "to serve the living and true God." And the verses which go before, prove directly the

contrary: "Many nations shall come and say, "Come, and let us go up to the mountain of "JEHOVAH, to the house of the God of Jacob,—and "he shall teach us of his ways, and we will walk "in his paths."[1] The worshippers of God profess, that "they will walk in the name of the Lord their "God for ever and ever:" yet many of Israel apostatized, and became idolaters; and numbers of idolaters have forsaken, and still greater numbers will forsake, their idols, to worship the true God.

P. 123. l. 19. 'The worship of Israel,' &c. If this mean the worship instituted by the *ritual* law of Moses, we cannot believe that it will 'endure for ever and ever.' We are confident that it is predicted in the Old Testament, that this ceremonial worship would be 'put away,' when the "Priest after the order of Melchisedek" should come: but, however that might be, it will hardly be maintained that the worship of heaven will be conducted according to the ritual law of Moses. As to the substance of the worship of Israel, as contained in the law and in the prophets, we firmly believe that it will endure to the end, and for ever: and that the gentiles become the people of God by joining in that spiritual worship of Israel, of which all their forms were shadows or prefigurations.—But, according to Mr. C.'s statement, what is to be done with the gentiles? The different forms 'of worship used by them are to be put away;' (l. 13—16.) 'yet they shall not become true wor-'shippers.' I suppose it is meant, that, in order to their being true worshippers, they must be pro-

[1] Mic. iv. 1—5.

selyted, and circumcised, become Jews, and keep the law. If this be intended, it might have been more clearly stated. Malachi however says, or rather the Lord by Malachi, "From the rising of "the sun even to the going down of the same, my "name shall be great among the gentiles: and *in* "*every place* incense shall be offered to my name, "and a pure offering; for my name shall be great "among the heathen saith the Lord of hosts."[1]

P. 123. l. 24. 'But let us see,' &c.:—l. 34. 'Forced to acknowledge,' &c. Nothing is said, in the passage quoted from Jeremiah,[2] of '*forced* 'to acknowledge.' Every true convert acknowledges his guilt, without compulsion; and so will the Israelites, when converted and restored.[3] "*Coming* to the Lord from the ends of the "earth," implies a *voluntary* renunciation of idols, to join his worshippers; if words, when the gentiles are concerned, can express that idea: and surely there are other ways of 'knowing the 'hand and might of God,' besides that of falling victims to his omnipotent vengeance; Supposing that multitudes of the opposing nations should be crushed by 'the hand and power of God;' and others, thus perceiving how immensely superior he is to all the idols of their worship, should submit to him, seek mercy, renounce idols, and become his spiritual worshippers; will this not be a fulfilment of the prophecy? Beyond doubt, this, for substance, was meant by it.

P. 124. l. 7. 'Further we observe,' &c.—Impenitent criminals do not generally 'come of

[1] Mal. i. 11. [2] Jer. xvi. 19—21. [3] Zech. xii. 10.

'their own accord,' without 'being called,' in order to be punished.

P. 124. l. 19. 'No need to shew miracles, except in Egypt.'—Whether there was or was not *need*, many and great miracles both of mercy and judgment were shewn in the wilderness, 'in the 'time of Moses:'[1] and without these, it does not appear how the people could have been sustained; Moses and Aaron protected; and either the return of the whole company to Egypt, or their entire destruction in the infatuated attempt prevented.

P. 124. l. 21. 'Miracles will be shewn,' &c.—There is no proof of this in scripture. God will work powerfully in restoring Israel; and he may, for aught which is said to the contrary, work miracles of vengeance, like those wrought in Egypt: but that this will be 'in the whole world' is no where intimated, nor is it in the least probable.—Christian expositors have drawn many confident conclusions from the obscure prophecy in the eighteenth of Isaiah, not wholly dissimilar from that of Mr. C.: but, as I cannot *adopt*, so I do not presume to *oppose*, their reasonings: the event must determine. (l. 24.)

P. 124. l. 29. 'Scattered throughout the whole 'land of Egypt.'—This directly contradicts the history by Moses. The Israelites dwelt together in Goshen, "and had light in their dwellings" during the plague of darkness. In what manner were they 'all brought together in one time?' (p. 125. l. 5.) 'And how shall the Israelites at their

[1] Ex. xv. 25. xvi. 11—35. xvii. 5—17. Num. xi. 18—23, 31—33. xiv. 22, 23, 37. xvi. 25—35, 44—49. xvii. 5—10.

'restoration be brought together?' (l. 10.) God will do it, no doubt; but will they be *miraculously transported* from one country to another? This is no where intimated.[1]

P. 125. l. 10. I will not enter into any argument concerning the texts of scripture here adduced: though it may be well doubted, whether, they all relate to the future 'restoration of Israel' or not; for I do not deny that they may be literally fulfilled in that event. But the misquotation of one passage from Isaiah must be noticed. The text is, "Darkness shall cover the earth, and gross "darkness the people," or *peoples*, which includes Israel also. Mr. C. puts "*the kingdoms*," as excluding Israel. But I apprehend that the calling of the gentiles in the primitive times, the restoration of Israel, and the conversion of the gentiles all over the earth, and the millennium, are all predicted in this chapter.[2]

P. 126. l. 11. 'Every true son of Abraham.'—Does this include *upright* proselytes? Does it exclude *wicked* Israelites? The New Testament necessarily suggests to Christians another view of 'the true sons of Abraham,'[3] but on that it would be improper to insist.

P. 126. 12. 'Afraid to come near him.'—"Ten "men, out of all languages of the nations, even "shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, "saying, We will go with you; for we have "heard that God is with you."[4] Christians believe that *love* will draw the gentiles to converted

[1] Is. xi. 11—16. lxvi. 19, 20.
[2] Is. lx.
[3] Rom. iv. 11—18. Gal. iii. 7, 29.
[4] Zech. viii. 23.

Israel; Jews imagine that *fear* will drive them to a distance from them. I own I had rather be loved than dreaded; "perfect love casteth out "fear."

P. 126. l. 16. The twenty-fourth chapter of Isaiah is generally considered as a prophecy which more especially relates to Israel, and to all their dispersions and sufferings hitherto; with intimations of mercy to the gentiles, and to a remnant of Israel;[1] and a glorious event to the whole: but the interpretation of it does not concern our main subject. No doubt very great troubles will be experienced by the nations of the earth, at that grand crisis which will terminate in the glorious millennium; and the conclusion of the chapter certainly predicts that event, however the other parts of it may be explained.

P. 126. l. 19. The two last verses in the thirteenth chapter of Zechariah most evidently predict the desolations of Jerusalem by the Romans; the subsequent miseries of the Jews; and the future conversion of Israel.[2]

P. 126. l. 21. "The breaker," &c.—There is no doubt concerning the *meaning* of the word translated "the Breaker," in Micah.[3] Let it here also be conceded, (though this is far from certain,) that the conversion and restoration of Israel are predicted; and that "the Breaker" is the Messiah: (Note, p. 126:) yet there is no intimation of his *coming* at that time; but only of his marching before the Jews, or "at the head of "them." He will, no doubt, at that time *break*

[1] Is. xxiv. 10—16. [2] Zech. xiii. 8, 9. [3] Micah ii. 13.

in pieces all obstinate opposers, as "with an iron "rod;" but he will also break *through* all hindrances and impediments; he will break *off* the chains and bondage of Israel; he will break *through* the impediment, arising from the pride, impenitence and unbelief of their uncircumcised hearts, the opposition of their carnal prejudices, and reigning sins; their "neck of steel and brow "of brass."[1] He will "break the stout heart, "and bind up the broken heart." He once broke the gates of the grave; he still quickens the dead in sin; and at length, "all that are in the graves "shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they "that have done good, unto the resurrection of "life; and they that have done evil, to the resur-"rection of damnation."[2]

The term "Breaker," may therefore mean far more, than 'crushing the gentiles.' All are his "enemies," who "will not have him to reign "over them:"[3] and "his hand shall find out "all his enemies, and make them as a fiery "oven in the day of wrath."[4] But whether *all* the gentiles, or the gentiles *exclusively* be those enemies, constitutes another and very different question. "The nation and kingdom that will "not serve thee shall perish;" but not such nations or individuals as welcome the salvation of Zion's King, and join themselves to his people.

P. 126. l. 28. 'Who hath believed,' &c.—This is the only place in which the fifty-third of Isaiah is quoted or referred to: and, as some further

[1] Is. xlviii. 4.
[2] John v. 28—29.
[3] Luke xix. 27.
[4] Psalm xxi. 8, 9.

notice must be taken of it, I shall not examine particularly this application of the question with which it begins: the New Testament applies it far otherwise.[1] But it may be asked, in what sense could this be the report of the gentiles? How could they say, "Who hath believed *our* report?"

P. 127. l. 23. 'Pick up every Jew,' &c.—This conduct will scarcely be adopted by the *enemies* of God and Israel. As far as the prophecies adduced relate to events yet future, the full and clear understanding of them must be waited for till the accomplishment take place. (l. 9—21.) It cannot, however, be supposed that those gentiles, who so zealously and laboriously concur in bringing Israel into their own land, will be involved in the destruction of those who obstinately oppose them.

P. 127. l. 30. 'Your brethren.'—Probably it will be found that "the brethren" here spoken of[2] will be the converted gentiles, presented as an oblation to JEHOVAH, by the Jews, "on whose "skirt they have laid hold:"[3] for when it is said, "I will also take of them for priests and Levites," it does not appear how Israelites *of the other tribes* could possibly be meant. None who are not already Levites can be taken according to the law as Levites, none as priests who are not priests of Aaron's race. But to take of the gentiles ministers of religion, as the priests and Levites were in Israel, was an event worthy to be dignified by

[1] John xii. 37, 38. Rom. x. 15—17. [2] Is. lxvi. 20, 21.
[3] Rom. xv. 16.

place in prophecy; and the more so as it was
emote from every thought and expectation of the
ews.

P. 128. l. 12. 'Next to this,' &c.—This accords
ore nearly with our sentiments, than with the
revious statement of the author: and, with all
e attention of which I am capable, I cannot find
ut what his sentiments are concerning 'all the
nations of the earth,' after the opposition to the
estoration of Israel has finally ceased; except that
ey are to be "servants to Israel:" (l. 19.) but it
oes not so clearly appear, whether they will be
e accepted worshippers of Israel's God, or not.
shall soon proceed to consider the prophecy in
e forty-ninth of Isaiah; and shall here only ob-
rve, that Mr. C. has substituted *nations* for
ation: thus shifting off from the *nation* of Israel
at which is spoken of it, and charging it on the
ations of the heathen. The Hebrew is singular.
Whether the prophecies concerning the subjection
f the nations to Israel ought to be understood of
n outward subjection to the restored Jews, or
ot, might be questioned: but I have already
onceded most freely, that converted Israel will
ave a precedency in honour and love above all
ther people; no subjection will ever be required
y Israel, when "the Lord has circumcised his
heart," except that of love; and the superiority
ill be exercised in meekness, equity, and kind-
ess; from which none except obstinate enemies
ill be excepted.

There are several prophecies, which clearly im-
ly a subjection of all nations to one power, or
ollective body; in many of which the names,

Israel, Judah, Jacob, Zion, Jerusalem, are introduced.[1] But Christian expositors by no means consider these prophecies as predicting the *political* subjugation of all other people to the one nation of Israel. Daniel says, "I saw in the night visions, "and behold one like the Son of man came with "the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient "of days, and they brought him near before him; "and there was given to him dominion, and glory, "and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and "languages should serve him."—And again, "Un-"til the Ancient of days came, and judgment was "given to the saints of the Most High, and the "time came that the saints possessed the king-"dom." And again, "And the kingdom and do-"minion, and the greatness of the kingdom, shall "be given to the people of the saints of the Most "High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, "and all dominions shall serve and obey him."[2] In this prophecy nothing is said of *Israel* as a nation: and "the little horn which made war on "the saints,"[3] we consider as the principal enemy and persecutor of the Christian church. But, when the Messiah shall destroy this power, "the king-"doms of the earth shall become his kingdom," and that of all true believers, whether of Jewish or gentile extraction; they being one with him. Thus all nations will become subject to these "saints of the Most High." Many of us consider this as the clew to all the other prophecies on this subject in the Old Testament: and, being fully

[1] Is. xlix. 13—26. lx. lxvi. 10—24. Mic. vii. 12—20. Zech. xiv.
[2] Dan. vii. 13, 14, 22, 27. [3] Dan. vii. 21.

convinced that the New Testament is "the word "of God," we interpret them in connexion with the doctrine and the prophecies contained in it. Especially the words of the Apostle, "The pro- "mise, that he should be the heir of the world, "was not to Abraham and his seed through the "law, but through the righteousness of faith."[1] We do not suppose that Israel as a nation will be excluded: but that being in the first instance brought to submit to the Messiah in penitent faith and love, they will form a prëeminent part of this company: that, when God shall restore Israel to their own land, many nations will oppose them violently; as others will struggle hard against the general cause of Christianity: that in both respects terrible vengeance will come on vast multitudes: that the survivors, convinced that "God fighteth for Israel" and his church, will, at first perhaps with terror and reluctancy, submit to a power which they cannot resist: but after some farther interpositions of mercy and judgment, all nations will become willing subjects to Christ; and thus the saints as one with him shall possess the kingdom. We do not, however, expect that, so long as the Lord Jesus, and the New Testament, are rejected by the Jews, they will be satisfied with this interpretation: and, as it is not essential to the argument, concerning Jesus being the true Messiah, I shall not further insist on it. If I could conceive that the Messiah was not come; or that when he shall come his kingdom would be an earthly kingdom; I should feel no further interest in the

[1] Rom. iv. 11—14.

concern. Like other contests about temporal dominion, I should consider it wholly out of my line. The Lord who "doeth all things well," who once gave the kingdoms of the earth to Nebuchadnezzar, and at other times even to still viler lords, will give it to whom he sees good: and if he see good to give it to Israel as a nation, "his will be done."

Even with my present views of the subject, I feel little concern about it. I have no objection to Israel's having any degree of political dominion over other nations, which can be desirable, or even practicable. But an universal political empire, over all the four continents and the isles of the sea, exercised by one nation, in a small country in Asia, seems ill to accord to many prophecies; and in its own nature it is not at all probable, or indeed conceivable.[1] This, however, which forms so large and *prominent* a part of Mr. C.'s book, seems to me an object of no consequence, where the great concerns of eternal salvation, or its awful alternative, are under consideration.

Indeed, the grand subject of debate should be brought back, from all conjectures of what *shall be*, to a simple and accurate consideration of what *hath been*: for we are far more in danger of erring, in respect of unaccomplished prophecies, than in respect of those events which have evidently occured on earth. The fulfilment of the prophecies, concerning the Messiah and his kingdom, in Jesus Christ and the success of Christianity, may be clearly made out: but both Jews and Christians have to encounter many difficulties in explaining

[1] Is. xlix. 23, lx. 10. 16.

unfulfilled prophecies; and will probably all of them in the event discover how greatly they were mistaken.

P. 129. l. 17. 'The life of Israel,' &c.—Does this mean the life of every individual Israelite, or the continuance of Israel's dominion over the nations? The duration of the church's prosperity, and of Israel, will be at least a thousand years.

P. 129. l. 21. '*Days of the tree of life.*'—The words *of life* are not found in the passage in Isaiah. An oak from its first planting till its final decay by old age, is supposed in some instances to last a thousand years. This seems referred to: but it is not clear what can be meant by 'the days of 'the tree of life;' or what tree of life is intended.[1]

P. 129. l. 27. 'THE UNITY OF GOD ESTABLISHED.' P. 130. l. 24. 'Because he is not worshipped,' &c.—It seems, then, that the Lord will reign and be worshipped, as the only God, all over the earth: and, if so, "all the gentiles," as well as Israel, will thus obey and worship him.

P. 131. l. 1. 'Joash king of Judah, was the 'second,' &c.—There is no scriptural record concerning Joash making 'himself a god.'[2]

P. 131. l. 6. 'Hiram, king of Tyrus,' &c.—It is generally supposed that the name of this king of Tyre was Ithobalus, or Ethbaal. The name Hiram, however, does not occur.[3]

P. 131. l. 12. 'Every man,' &c.—Nebuchadnezzar lived some time after his extraordinary madness,

[1] Gen. ii. 9. iii. 22—24. Prov. iii. 18. xi. 30. xiii. 12. xv. 4. Rev. ii. 7. xxii. 2. 14.

[2] 2 Kings xii. 18—21. 2 Chron. xxiv. 17—25.

[3] Ezek. xxviii. 1—19.

died a natural death, and was evidently a humble penitent worshipper of JEHOVAH. It is not indeed said that Nebuchadnezzar 'made himself a god;' though his arrogant language seemed to imply it.[1] The language ascribed to the king of Babylon by Isaiah was intended chiefly for Belshazzar.[2]—It is also meant that the crucifixion of Jesus was the punishment of his claim; but "he was declared "to be the Son of God with power, by the resur- "rection from the dead."[3] Herod, who put James to death, and, because it pleased the Jews, purposed to kill Peter also, should have been added to the list;[4] if not from the New Testament, yet from Josephus.

P. 131. l. 24. 'If he will still say,' &c.—*Balaam* is the antecedent: but the writer means, 'If any 'one will say, Man is a God, tell him he is a liar.' That is, if a Christian will say this of Jesus, Balaam is directed to 'call him a liar.' It is not clear how Mr. C. makes out this meaning from Balaam's words;[5] but the interpretation is so little plausible, that it may be safely left.

P. 131. l. 25. 'They that make them:'—that is, *images*. Mr. C. in this and the following quotations and reasonings, (p. 131, 132,) endeavours to disprove the deity of Christ, or rather to set his seal to the sentence of the Jewish Sanhedrin, that he deserved to die, "because he, being a man, "made himself God."[6] But certainly texts proving that images of gold and silver, wood or stone, are

[1] Dan. iii. 15. iv. 30. v. 19, 20.
[2] Is. xiv. 12—14.
[3] Rom. i. 4.
[4] Acts xii. 1—4, 21—24.
[5] Numb. xxiii. 19.
[6] John x. 33.

not god, must be wholly irrelevant to the argument; as well, as all declarations, that *man* is not *God*, or that *Unity* is not *Trinity*. (P. 134. l. 25—30.)—After all the laboured, acute, and learned efforts of Socinians, and other nominal Christians, against the doctrine of the TRINITY; the loose and general objections against it, thrown together in this place, are not greatly to be dreaded. A large proportion of learned Trinitarians give up, as an interpolation, the text quoted from John;[1] yet whether authentic or not, it must be allowed to be a clear and concise statement of our doctrine. "The Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and "these three are one:" (Οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσι.) These three persons (*masc.*) "are one" (*neuter,*) θεῖον, *numen*. We allow that the clearest and fullest revelation of this mystery is contained in the New Testament. There it is so full and undeniable, that Antitrinitarians have evidently no resource left them, but to pronounce very many of the passages in proof of it, either *interpolations*, or *corrupt readings*, or *the erroneous conclusions* of the writer, as a fallible man and a feeble reasoner. If this procedure, which reduces the word of God to a level with other 'ancient, venerable, and 'authentic books,' claiming no *divine inspiration*, be not needful to their tottering cause, why do they so constantly have recourse to it?—But, indeed, even the Jews may teach them that it is the doctrine of the New Testament; as one of their strongest objections to this sacred book is taken from that doctrine being so undeniably contained

[1] 1 John v. 7, 8.

in it. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.* Let the point once be established, that Jesus is the Messiah predicted in the Old Testament; and the proof that the doctrine of the Trinity is taught by him, and his apostles, will not be a matter of great difficulty.

On the question, 'Was the Messiah to be a 'mere man like other men?' some things have been adduced from the Old Testament, as to his Deity, which, I am confident, cannot easily be answered. In addition to these, it may here be observed, on the general doctrine; that the name of God in Hebrew being plural, and yet almost always, in this sense of it, used with singular verbs and pronouns; is at least a remarkable circumstance in the phraseology of that book, which especially makes known to "mankind the one living "and true God," as distinguished from all false gods. The language used in the creation of Adam, "Let *us* make man, in *our* image, after *our* like-"ness: so God created man in his own image, "in the image of God created he him."[1] The circumstance also, that in the Hebrew the word rendered CREATOR is plural, "Remember thy "*Creators;*" (Marg;[2]) and many other things of this kind, are such as Antitrinitarians, Jews or Christians, would not have previously *expected;* and which, however light they may affect to make of them, they would much rather had not been found in scripture.

The following passage from the law, is worthy of notice in this argument: "On this wise ye shall

[1] Gen. i. 26, 27. [2] Ec. xii. 1.

" bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, " JEHOVAH bless thee and keep thee; JEHOVAH " make his face to shine upon thee, and be gra- " cious unto thee; JEHOVAH lift up his countenance " upon thee and give thee peace; and they shall " put my NAME upon the children of Israel, and I " will bless them." This threefold repetition of the name, JEHOVAH, has generally been considered as implying some mystery: yet who, except the man who believes a Trinity of persons in the unity of the Godhead, can shew what that mystery is? and what Christian can help recollecting the form of Christian baptism, " In the NAME (*one* NAME,) " of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy " Ghost?" or the Christian benediction, " The " grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of " God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be " with you all. Amen?"[1]

Some explication of those texts which speak expressly of the Messiah as God;[2] yea, some peculiarly *satisfactory* explication ought in all reason to be given; before the doctrine should be treated with decided *irreverence*.

What shall we say to the command, " Kiss the " Son, lest he be angry;" and to the exclamation, " Blessed are all they who trust in him?"[3] Do not both these ascribe *divine* honour and worship to him?[4]—" Cursed is he that trusteth in man, and " maketh flesh his arm. Blessed is the man that " trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord

[1] Numb. vi. 23—27. Matt. xxviii. 19. 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

[2] Ps. xlv. 8. Jer. xvii. 5, 6. Is. vii. 14. ix. 6, 7. Mic. v. 2, Zech. xiii. 10. [3] Ps. ii. 12. [4] Ps. cxlvi. 3, 4.

"is." How then can he be *blessed* who trusteth in the Messiah, if the Messiah be only 'man like 'other men?' And, if the Messiah be not meant, what man, or angel, or creature, can be substituted in his place, to whom Jehovah would say, "Kiss "the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish from "the way, when his wrath be kindled, yea, but a "little. Blessed are all they that put their trust "in him?"[1]

The language of many Scriptures, which are little regarded in the argument, requires somewhat more notice.

Thus we read in Isaiah: "Hearken unto me, O "Jacob and Israel, my called, I am he. I am the "First, I also am the Last.[2] My hand also hath "laid the foundation of the earth, and my right "hand hath spanned the heavens: when I call, "they stand up together. All ye, assemble your-"selves, and hear; which among them hath de-"clared these things? The Lord hath loved him; "he will do his pleasure on Babylon, and his "arm shall be on the Chaldeans. I, even I, "have spoken; yea, I have called him; I have "brought him, and he shall make his way pros-"perous. Come ye near unto me, hear ye this. "I have not spoken in secret from the beginning: "from the time that it was, there am I; and now "the Lord God, and his Spirit hath sent me."[3] Who is the speaker in this passage? There is not the least intimation of any change in the person

[1] Is. xi. 10. xii. 2. Matt. xii. 21. Rom. xv. 12. Eph. i. 12, 13.
[2] Is. xli. 4. xliv. 6. Rev. i. 11. 17. ii. 8. xxii. 13.
[3] Is. xlviii. 12—16.

speaking in the former and in the latter part of the quotation; in which the peculiar style of Deity, and the name JEHOVAH are used. Even in the latter part, he speaks decidedly the language of Deity; yet he says, "Adonai JEHOVAH, and his "Spirit hath sent me." Or, "hath sent me, and his Spirit." For this is the more obvious rendering of the clause.

Is there then in this passage nothing favouring the doctrine of the Messiah's Deity, or that of the Trinity? In like manner, by another prophet; "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, after the glory "hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled "you: for he that toucheth you, toucheth the "apple of his eye. For, behold, *I will shake mine* "*hand* upon them, and they shall be a spoil to "their servants; and ye shall know that the "Lord of hosts hath sent me. Sing and rejoice, "O daughter of Zion; for lo, I come, and I will "dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord: and "many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that "day, and shall be *my people*: and *I will dwell* "*in the midst of thee*, and thou shalt know, that "the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee."[1] I must entreat the reader to examine carefully the language of this prophecy. I have marked some clauses, in Italics, as requiring peculiar notice. But it is manifest that the speaker repeatedly calls himself JEHOVAH; and uses expressions peculiar to God; and yet he says again and again, "the "Lord of hosts hath sent me." I scarcely know any passage in the New Testament more decided

[1] Zech. ii. 8—11. See also Zech. iii. 1, 2. vi. 12—14. xii. 10.

in this respect; and it must lead him, who is intimately conversant with the scriptures, to recollect the several texts in which it is said, "God dwelleth "in you;" "Christ dwelleth in you;" "Ye are "the temple of God, and the Spirit of God "dwelleth in you."[1] Especially the words of our Lord must occur to him, "The Spirit of truth "dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." "If a "man love me he will keep my words, and my "Father will love him; and *we will come to him,* "*and make our abode with him.*"[2]

Again, we read in Malachi; "The Lord whom "ye seek, shall suddenly come to *his temple,* even "the Messenger of the covenant whom ye delight "in; behold he shall come, saith the Lord of "hosts."[3] Here again I ask, who is this Lord that shall come to *his temple?* Surely the temple was not consecrated to man, or angel, or any other except JEHOVAH. Had modern Antitrinitarians dictated the scriptures, we should no more have met with this phrascology in the Old Testament, than in the New, with the passage of John supposed to be interpolated; or another, which is not said to be so: "We know, that the Son of "God is come, and hath given us an under-"standing, that we may know him that is true; "and we are in him that is true, even in his Son "Jesus Christ. This (Ὁυτος) is the true God, and "eternal life. Little children keep yourselves "from idols."[4] I say again, all Antitrinitarians had much rather these passages were not found in

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 16.
[2] John xiv. 16—23.
[3] Mal. iii. 1, 2.
[4] 1 John v. 20, 21.

the scriptures; and would be glad to alter or expunge them.

The traditions of almost every nation contain something analagous to *plurality* in *unity*, however distorted, in respect of the Deity: and many passages have by learned men been adduced even from the Targums and Talmuds of the Jews, which concur in this opinion. I do not adduce these things as *proofs;* but to induce Jews, as well as others, to use more caution and reverence of God, in speaking on this sublime, mysterious, and awful subject; and in order to shew that Christians did not invent the doctrine of the Trinity. "Canst thou by searching find out God? "canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection!" We cannot comprehend ourselves, or how "body, "soul, and spirit," form one individual man: how then are we competent to decide, as *ex cathedra*, concerning the infinite God?

P. 132. l. 13. 'What does Paul mean by this 'sentence, All in all?'[1]—'He saith not that the 'FATHER, mentioned in the twenty-fourth verse, 'but that "GOD may be all in all:" and so he 'seems to lead us to that interpretation of the 'Godhead, which comprehends Father, Son, and 'Holy Ghost; that the Godhead may govern all 'things by himself, without the intervention of a 'Mediator to exact our obedience in his name, 'and to convey to us favours and rewards. So 'as now Christ, God-man, is "all in all," (Col. iii. '11;) because the Father hath put all things into 'his hand, does all things, and governs all things

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 28.

'by him; when this economy ceases, the Godhead 'will be "all in all."' (*Whitby.*)

'The distinction between the *absolute*, universal, 'and everlasting kingdom of God, the Governor 'of all; and the *mediatorial kingdom* of Christ, as 'instituted for the benefit of fallen man, which 'was intended to endure for a time, in order to 'accomplish certain important ends, to the glory 'of God in man's salvation; will, after the day of 'judgment, be terminated. Christ, having exe-'cuted his commission, will cease to reign over 'all worlds, as Mediator, having publicly delivered 'up the kingdom to God in the person of the 'Father: yet he will, in human nature, retain a 'peculiar authority over his redeemed people; 'and, as one with the Father, he will, with him 'and the Holy Spirit, reign one "God over all 'blessed for evermore." Nor will he any more 'cease to reign *in this sense*, when he hath given 'up the mediatorial kingdom, than the Father 'ceased to reign, when he appointed the Son to 'that kingdom.' (*The Author's Commentary.*)

P. 132. l. 26. 'The last verse,' &c.—As God was pleased that his servant Moses should place the verse in question *last*, it seems not very reverential to say, 'Why is not this verse first in 'the song, as *indeed it ought to be?*' I think few persons will be satisfied with the reason assigned for the transposition; however assured he may be "that the kingdoms of the earth" shall, in *the last days*, become the kingdoms of God and his Messiah.

P. 133. l. 10. "My Father is greater than I."—'As Mediator, I receive my commission from the

'Father: and, as I am his Ambassador, he is my 'Principal, and as such my superior.' An ambassador is equal in nature to his prince. "*Neither the Son, but the Father.*"

P. 133. l. 14. 'Of that day and that hour.'—The Son, as Mediator, does not *know that day*; it being no part of that "revelation which was "given" him to make known to his church.—Let the reader compare this part, which consists of quotations from the New Testament, with the language of angels concerning the "Lamb that "was slain," in the Revelation of St. John.[1]

P. 133. l. 33. 'The difference is uncommonly 'great,' &c.—The Pharisees ascribed the miracles of Jesus to the power of Satan: thus they "blas-"phemed the Son of man," during the season of his humiliation. They also condemned him to death, as a blasphemer, for making "himself "God." But he arose from the dead. "This "Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are "witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand "of God exalted, and having received of the "Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath "shed forth this, which ye now see and hear."[2] Thus he was "justified by the Spirit:" and they who rejected this last demonstration of his being the divine Messiah, would never be forgiven: not because the Holy Ghost is greater than the Son, but because the guilt of those, who blasphemed this grand proof that Jesus was the Messiah, was more heinous than the guilt of those, who blasphemed him when living as Man on earth.—If a Jew will

[1] Rev. v. 12—14. [2] Acts ii. 32, 33.

attempt to prove his doctrine from the New Testament, he must so far be answered from the New Testament, and according to it.—Indeed Jesus may be said to be greater than the Holy Spirit, in the very same way in which the Father is greater than the Son: not in nature and perfections; but as sending him, and being glorified by him, as the principal by his ambassador. All other inferiority Trinitarians deny.

If Jesus be Immanuel, he is both God and Man: whatever is said of him as man, must be understood of his human nature: whatever of him as God, of his divine nature. Suppose, for a moment, the doctrine to be true; we ask, How could it be possible to speak of him in other language than that which he uses concerning himself, and which the writers of the New Testament use concerning him? Before any objection can be made to bear against this language; the doctrine must either be proved *false*, or, by a *petitio principii*, be assumed to be false.

P. 134. l. 2. 'Secondly, Christ says, Not,' &c. In condescension to Jewish prejudices, and those of Jewish converts to Christianity, some particulars of the Mosaic law were recommended to the observation even of the gentile converts; but the Apostles evidently considered *that law* as, in itself, abolished. On the other hand, our Lord by no means intended that his disciples should, during his life, in any instance disobey the *written ceremonial* law. He himself perfectly observed it, and taught them to do the same.[1] The *oral* law,

[1] Matt. xxiii. 2, 3.

"the traditions of the elders," he indeed protested against, as "making void" the written law of God. These hints suffice to shew, that there was no discordance between our Lord's doctrine and that of the apostles, as speaking by the Holy Spirit.

That the words and works of Christ, and those of the Holy Spirit, were, according to the New Testament, in many respects one and the same, might easily be shewn: let the reader carefully compare the texts referred to in the margin, and he must be convinced of this. [1]

P. 134. l. 17. 'A man,' &c.—That Jesus was "a man approved of God," no Christian denies: but how does this prove that he was no more than a man? Even by assuming, before all proof, that the doctrine in debate is false and impossible, and in no other way. But is this sound logic?

P. 134. l. 31. 'To take the glory,' &c.—If we give the glory due to God 'to a mortal man,' or to any creature, we are guilty of idolatry. But, except by assuming without proof that our doctrine is false, this does not evince that our worship of Jesus Christ is idolatry: for we believe him to be One with the Father and the Holy Spirit, "God over all, blessed for evermore." He requires, and we believe that he had a full right to require, that "all men should honour the Son, "even as they honour the Father: he that hon- "oureth not the Son honoureth not the Father "which hath sent him." [2] And we must have far

[1] Matt. x. 20. Mark xiii. 11. Luke xii. 12. xxi. 15. Rev. ii. 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 17, 18, 29. iii. 1, 6, 7, 13, 14, 22. [2] John v. 23.

stronger arguments than those here adduced, to convince us that we are mistaken in this grand concern.

But, if indeed the great and glorious God do subsist in three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; if he have revealed this, as plainly as words can convey the mysterious truth; and if men, "leaning to their own understanding," treat this revelation as a LIE; ("He that believeth not, hath "made God a liar;") is there, I say, no danger on the other side? Is it not possible, that the 'Supreme Being' of Antitrinitarians, whether Jews, Christians, or Mohammedans, may be no more the true God, than Baal or Jupiter was? Not only the mysteries of his nature, but the *perfections* of his justice and holiness, are (to say no more,) grievously veiled and clouded by all Antitrinitarians. "The HOLY ONE of Israel ceases "from before us." "A JUST GOD AND A SAVIOUR" is not recognised. Mercy, without an atonement of infinite value, dishonours the law and justice of God; and many of us are greatly alarmed in respect of Antitrinitarians, lest they should be found worshippers of an ideal Supreme Being, an *ens rationis:* though not "the work of their own "hands," yet the creation of their imagination; and no more the God of Abraham, "the Holy "One of Israel," "the God and Father of our "Lord Jesus Christ," than the supreme deity of the Chinese or Hindoos. An impartial man must allow, that there is danger on both sides: and none, but he who *takes it for granted* that his own doctrine is true, and his opponent's false,

will contend that all the danger lies on one side.[1]

Some at least of the Jews consider Christianity as *materializing* or *corporalizing* the divine essence: but this originates wholly from misapprehension. It cannot be denied that there have been Christians, so called, who at least give occasion for such a charge; and indeed there still are; but Christianity itself is not answerable for any sentiment which is not authorized by the New Testament. And in this sacred book, where especially the doctrine of the Trinity is most fully revealed; the idea of '*materializing* or *corporal-*' *izing*, the divine essence,' is wholly excluded. "No man hath seen God at any time." "The "King eternal, immortal, *invisible*," "whom no "man hath seen, or can see."[2] The doctrine of "God manifest in the flesh" does not suppose that the divine essence is *corporalized;* but that it manifests itself to man in and through the human nature of Jesus Christ, who is "the image "of the invisible God," and "in whom it pleased "all fulness to dwell," even "all the fulness of "the Godhead bodily:"[3] for "the Word *became* "(ἐγένετο) flesh, and tabernacled among us;" (ἐσκήνωσεν;) as the glory of JEHOVAH did in the tabernacle in the wilderness, or in Solomon's temple. Therefore Jesus said, "Destroy this "temple:"—"he spake of the temple of his "body," or of his human nature.[4] The divine perfections are displayed in the person, and by

[1] See Matt. xi. 27. John v. 23. 1 John ii. 23. v. 21, 22.
[2] John i. 18. 1 Tim. i. 17. vi. 16.
[3] Col. i. 15, 19. ii. 9. Heb. i, 3. [4] John i. 14. ii. 19—21.

the words and works of Christ, who, as God, is "One with the Father;" and his divine nature is manifested in and through his human nature, being mysteriously united to it. Thus, 'as the 'reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and 'Man is one Christ.' But this *materializes* or *corporalizes*, neither the reasonable soul, nor the divine essence. 'One, not by the conversion of 'the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the man-'hood into God.'[1] Perhaps no Protestant creed enters so minutely into particulars, or approaches so near the vain attempt to render the incomprehensible mystery of the Trinity *comprehensible* as the Athanasian Creed does: yet it most decidedly protests against the idea of *corporalizing* the essence of the Deity. "The form of God,"[2] which some object to, has nothing to do with *materialism*. "A spirit stood before me; I could not "discern the *form* thereof;" says Eliphaz in Job.[3] "The *form* of the fourth is as the Son of God," says Nebuchadnezzar of the angel who appeared with the three young Jews in the fiery furnace.[4] "The similitude of JEHOVAH shall he behold."[5] This similitude of JEHOVAH, we believe to be "the "form of God," in which the only begotten Son of God manifested himself, to the patriarchs, to Moses, and to others. "No man hath seen God "at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in "the bosom of the Father, he hath declared "him."[6] *Forma animi æterna,* ('the form of the 'mind is eternal,) says Tacitus, who, as neither

[1] Athan. Creed. [2] Phil. ii. 6. [3] Job iv. 15, 16.
[4] Dan. iii. 25. [5] Num. xii. 8. [6] John i. 18.

Jew nor Christian, may be supposed impartial: but had he any idea of *materializing* or *corporalizing* the human soul?—It might easily be shewn, that there are expressions and narrations in the Old Testament, more suited to convey this idea, than any in the New:[1] but I reverence the word of God in both Testaments, and am confident that, properly interpreted, the whole sacred volume is calculated to exclude all such gross ideas of the divine essence, and deeply to impress the contrary:—"God is a Spirit, and they that wor-"ship him must worship in spirit and in truth."[2]

P. 135. l. 6.—I do not object to the *conclusion* which Mr. C. deduces from the text in Deuteronomy: "I shall cause them to die, that "shall say there is another God:" and it would be a relief to hear him speak so seriously about "the second death," (p. 135. l. 12.) and 'the day 'of judgment,' were it not counterbalanced by other considerations. As, however, the clause, "the second death," is taken from the New Testament; the several passages where it occurs, are seriously recommended to his attention.[3] Christians, at least Protestant Christians, hold as strongly as the Jews, that it is a damnable sin, to give divine honour to any creature, to any except God: but they believe, that the One living and true God incomprehensibly exists as three Persons, "The Father, the Son, and "the Holy Ghost:" into whose one *name*, we are baptized. Divine perfections are ascribed

[1] Gen. iii. 8. xxxii. 24—29. Exod. xxiv. 10. Hos. xii. 3—5.
[2] John iv. 24. [3] Rev. ii. 11. xx. 14, 15. xxi. 8.

to each separately; divine operations are stated to be performed by each, and divine honours are rendered to each: yet there is only "One "living and true God." This we think revealed in the whole scripture, but most clearly in the New Testament.

But, though I do not object to Mr. C.'s *conclusion* from the passage adduced, I must strongly object to his new version of it, which is only a translation of a part of the verse, and not at all consistent with the other part of it.—"For I, I, "HE, and there is no God besides me: I cause to "die, and I cause to live: I wound and I heal, "and not from my hand a deliverer." This, I think, is strictly a *literal translation*. There is no pronoun affix to the verb, "I cause to die," which there should be, to give even the former clause the meaning Mr. C. puts upon it; and the latter part is wholly incompatible with it. Had a Christian taken such a liberty with the scripture, and in the same manner, I should have marked it with more indignant disapprobation,

P. 135. l. 14. 'O how wonderful,' &c.—It is indeed wonderful, that such an immense majority of Christians, during almost 1800 years, including the most sagacious, the most learned, the most holy, pious, and useful men, whom the world ever saw, should have maintained the doctrine of the Trinity: and have formed both their creeds, and liturgies, and their whole worship, with all their hopes of eternal salvation, and all their motives for self-denying labours and patient sufferings,—from this doctrine; if it be not the doctrine of revelation? And that they should have been so deeply con-

vinced in the midst of persecutions, and at the approach of violent, or natural, death, that it was the "sure testimony of God." It is also most wonderful, that at the reformation from Popery, when every part of Christianity, as corrupted by Papists and others, was examined and reexamined, with the most acute, patient, and diligent investigation, by men of no ordinary talents and learning, many of whom sealed their testimony in the flames, and others lived in constant expectation of the same martyrdom; when numberless *ancient*, and in that view *venerable*, notions and practices were abolished, asantichristian; that they, I say, at this crisis, should, *without one exception*, as to a collective body, have retained the doctrine of the Trinity in their creeds, articles, and liturgies. This is indeed wonderful, if it be not the doctrine of scripture. That they should also persist in recommending this faith, with their dying lips, to their surviving friends: that this should, especially, have been the case with those who spent their lives in studying the scriptures! That all the labours of able, zealous, and learned Socinians, as well as the sneers and sarcasms of avowed infidels, should have effected so very little comparatively in opposition to it, and that little by no means permanent: and that, in every age, the men who have most zealously aimed to effect the conversion of idolaters, in every part of the globe, to the worship of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the wicked from the errors of their ways, should have held, as ESSENTIAL to Christianity, the doctrine of the Trinity: these things are indeed won-

derful, most wonderful, absolutely unaccountable: and, if they were not capable of such proof as excludes doubt, they would be perfectly incredible. If this be not the doctrine of the prophets, and of the apostles of Jesus Christ, this fact is indeed more wonderful than any of the miracles recorded in scripture; or any other well attested fact in universal history.

If the writer may be permitted to speak of himself, after such a *venerable* company, he would say; that, before he had, with any proportionable degree of seriousness and diligence, studied the scriptures, he was a Socinian; and could have retailed all the ordinary objections to the doctrine of the Trinity, and the other doctrines which depend on it, with sufficient plausibility and confidence, and with an assumed air of superior discernment: but by searching the scriptures with great assiduity, and by prayer for that wisdom, which God has promised to those who seek wisdom from him, as one in most deep concern about the salvation of his own soul; with little aid from Trinitarian writers, and none from preachers; after much opposition of heart to the doctrine, he became, in about two years, a decided Trinitarian. This has been stated in 'The Force of Truth,' which has now been published more than thirty-six years. All these years have been employed almost exclusively, in searching and explaining the scriptures, from the pulpit and the press: and, at this day, his assurance that the doctrine of the Trinity is the clear testimony of God in his holy oracles, is even stronger than ever. He, indeed, finds no

capacity of *doubting* the doctrine, except on the supposition, that the scriptures are not the *word of God.*

P. 135. l. 17. 'A father is above the son,' &c. —Not in *nature* certainly; but merely as the senior and superior relation; the same nature being common to both.

P. 136. l. 12. 'The gentiles to know that his 'name is not three, but ONE.'—Every zealot for a sect, or a sentiment, is ready to say, 'Ere long all will be of my opinion:' but, I do not read in the prophets, that 'God will cause the gentiles to 'know, that his name is not three but ONE.' Christians, however, have no objection to the position: "Baptize them in the *name*" (not *names*) "of "the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy "Ghost." Certainly three *names* do not imply three persons. Marcus Tullius Cicero, Caius Julius Cæsar; each three names of the same man: but we have no objection to *three persons.* Our doctrine is, Three persons and one God

---

Here Mr. C. closes: but, before I close, I must take some notice of his OMISSIONS. He has never, as it has before been observed, brought forward the question, Whether it was predicted that the Messiah should be a Priest, or not? He has not stated whether the predicted Messiah was to die, or not; probably he thinks that he will not. But, supposing him to die, whether he would die a natural or a violent death: if a violent death, in

what manner, and by whom, and what the event would be; whether as a sacrifice for sin, or not. Mr. C. must know that Christians lay very great stress on each of these particulars; and they consider certain parts of the Old Testament as most explicitly and undeniably predicting them, even to *minuteness;* in short, that all the prophets "testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and "the glory which should follow."

It has indeed been publicly asserted, and it remains, I believe, uncontradicted, that the Jews are forbidden by their Rabbies to read the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. If this be not true, it should be publicly contradicted.

Whatever were the motives of these, and other similar omissions, by Mr. C.; I must not conclude my answer without bringing forward, in a compendious manner, the substance of the prophecies of the Old Testament, on the following points.

I. Concerning the reception, with which the Messiah would meet from the nation of Israel.

II. Concerning his violent death, and that kind of death by which he would be cut off; with the special end and design of his crucifixion. And,

III. Concerning his resurrection, and subsequent glory; and the kingdom which he, as risen and ascended, would establish, preserve, and extend through the whole earth; to endure till the end of the world.

I. Concerning the reception, with which the Messiah would meet from the nation of Israel.

Thus we read in Isaiah: "Listen, O isles unto "me, and hearken, ye people from far: The Lord "hath called me from the womb: from the bowels "of my mother hath he made mention of my "name. And he hath made my mouth like a "sharp sword; in the shadow of his hand hath he "hid me, and made me a polished shaft; in his "quiver hath he hid me; and said unto me, Thou "art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be "glorified." It is plain, that the Messiah is intended in this prophecy; for the particulars specified in it never met, nor can meet, in any other person: and he may be called ISRAEL, in the same way as he is called "the seed of Abra-"ham," being "the GLORY of his people Israel;" the Head of that body which, with the Head, is "the Israel of God:" and as having, like Jacob, when he received the name of Israel, wrestled with God, and prevailed for the blessing.[1] But an *individual*, and not the nation, must be intended; or the whole which follows in the context will be destitute of meaning.—"Then I said, I "have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength "for nought, and in vain; yet surely my judg-"ment is with the Lord, and my work with my "God. And now, saith the Lord that formed "thee from the womb to be his servant, to bring "Jacob again to him; Though Israel be not "gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of "the Lord, and my God shall be my strength. "And he said, It is a light thing, that thou "shouldest be my servant, to raise up the tribes

[1] Comp. Hos. xii. 3,4. Heb. v. 7.

" of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: " I will also give thee for a light to the gentiles, " that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end " of the earth." The Messiah here complains of having " laboured in vain," evidently among his countrymen; and supposes that " Israel would " not be gathered;" that is, as a nation, at the first, or for a long time, but only a remnant of them; called " the preserved of Israel." In order to compensate this, and as something far beyond the " gathering of Israel;" JEHOVAH promises that he, the Messiah, " shall be the light of the " gentiles, and his salvation to the end of the " earth."—It then follows, " Thus saith the Lord, " the Redeemer of Israel, and his Holy One, to " him whom man despiseth, to him whom the " nation abhorreth," (גּוֹי singular, not גּוֹיִם plural,) " to a servant of rulers; Kings shall see and arise, " princes also shall worship, because of the Lord " that is faithful, and the Holy One of Israel, and " he shall choose thee."[1] Surely this prophecy leads us to expect that, when the true Messiah should appear, the nation of Israel, and the rulers of that nation, would reject, despise, and hate him; as they had generally done the prophets who went before him.

Again, in the same prophet, " Behold, my Ser- " vant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted " and extolled, and be very high. As many were " astonished at thee; (his visage was so marred " more than any man, and his form more than " the sons of men;) so shall he sprinkle many

[1] Is. xlix. 1—7.

"nations: the kings shall shut their mouths at "him: for that which hath not been told them shall "they see, and that which they have not heard "shall they consider."[1] 'This is the King Mes-'siah, who shall be exalted above Abraham, and 'extolled above Moses, and be high above the 'angels of the ministry.' (*Misrach Tenctuma, an ancient Jewish writing.*) Indeed, none but the Messiah can be meant. The same prophecy is evidently continued in the next chapter: "Who "hath believed our report? and to whom is the "arm of the Lord revealed? for he" (the Servant before mentioned) "shall grow up before him" (JEHOVAH) "as a tender plant, and as a root out "of a dry ground: he hath no form nor come-"liness; and when we shall see him there is no "beauty that we should desire him. He is de-"spised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, "and acquainted with grief: and we hid, as it "were, our faces from him; he was despised, and "we esteemed him not."[2] The very person, who "should be exalted, and extolled, and be very "high," would be "despised and rejected by "men," nay, by Israelites! Does not this prophecy, when carefully considered, tend to prepare the mind for the history of Jesus contained in the four evangelists? and for the Acts of the apostles? If the Messiah were not meant, let it be shewn in whom the prophecy has been, or ever can be, fulfilled.—The rest of the chapter will come under our consideration in another part of this inquiry.

[1] Is. lii. 13—15. [2] Is. liii. 1—3.

In a Psalm, which will shortly be more fully shewn to be a prediction of the Messiah, he is introduced as saying; "I am a worm, and no "man; a reproach of men, and despised of the "people. All that see me laugh me to scorn; "they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, "saying; He trusted on the Lord, that he would "deliver him; let him deliver him, seeing he "delighted in him."[1] The subsequent parts of the Psalm[2] could not be spoken by David, or by any other man, in those days, concerning himself: and nothing in the preceding part of the Psalm had been spoken of the gentiles: so that the reception of the Messiah by Israel is most undeniably predicted; "the sufferings of the Messiah "and the glory which should follow."—Several other Psalms relate to the same subject; but do not so obviously and expressly state it.[3]

Thus again, Isaiah; "Sanctify the Lord of "hosts himself: and let him be your fear, and let "him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanc- "tuary: but for a stone of stumbling, and for a "rock of offence, *to both the houses of Israel:* for "a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jeru- "salem: and many of them shall stumble, and fall, "and be broken, and be snared, and be taken."[4] Who is here spoken of, except Immanuel, just before mentioned?[5] Or, when did Israel so stumble and fall, in respect of "JEHOVAH of hosts," as in the rejection of Immanuel?

However the prophecy be interpreted, it stands

[1] Psalm xxii. 5—8. [2] Psalm xxii. 12—18.
[3] Psalm ii. 1—5. lxix. [4] Is. viii. 13—15. [5] Is. viii. 8.

indelibly on the face of it, that what should have been a sanctuary, would prove "a stone of stum-"bling, and a rock of offence, to both the houses "of Israel, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem." If Jesus was the promised Messiah, the fulfilment is known to all men: otherwise what events are predicted?

"The same stone, which the builders rejected, "is become the head-stone of the corner: this is "the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes."[1] I do not refer to the New Testament, as *authority* to Jews; but can they answer, as *an argument*, the application of this text by our Lord and his apostles?[2] What other so evident a fulfilment of it has ever taken place?

Again, one speaks by Zechariah; "Three "shepherds also I cut off in one month; and my "soul loathed them, and their soul also abhorred "me." "And I said unto them, If ye think good, "give me my price, and if not, forbear; so they "weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver; and "the Lord said unto me, Cast it to the potter; "a goodly price that I was prized at by them."[3] If the Messiah be not here spoken of: what events are narrated or predicted? If he be; then he, even JEHOVAH, would be "despised" and "abhorred by the shepherds of Israel;" in the manner recorded by the evangelists.

Enough has been said to shew, that it might previously have been expected, that the Messiah

[1] Ps. cxviii. 22, 23. [2] Matt. xxi. 42. Acts iv. 10, 11.
[3] Zech. xi. 8—13. Matt. xxvii. 3—10.

would be received with *contempt* and *aversion* by a large proportion of the people to whom it was sent, and especially by their rulers and teachers: but our next inquiry,

II. Concerning the death by which, according to the prophets, the Messiah would be cut off, will bring before us much more proof of this particular also.

Even the first promise of a Redeemer implied the idea that he would be a sufferer, "I will put "enmity between thee and the woman, and be- "tween thy seed and her Seed: it shall bruise "thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."[1] "The "sufferings of Christ and the glory which fol- "lowed," in the triumphs of Christianity over idolatry and wickedness, or the cause of Satan, constitute the best, and the only satisfactory comment on this original promise of a Messiah: yet the more complete fulfilment of the clause, "It shall "bruise thy head," is still future; as the clearest exposition of the clause, "Thou shalt bruise his "heel," is furnished by the crucifixion of Christ, and the persecutions of his people, by those very persons to whom he said, "Ye are of your father "the devil; and the lusts of your father ye will "do: he was a murderer from the beginning."[2]

But it would far exceed my limits to adduce, and comment on, all the prophecies respecting this subject in the Old Testament. "The Son of "man must suffer these things, and be rejected of "the chief priests, and scribes, and be slain, and

[1] Gen. iii. 15. [2] John viii, 44.

" be raised up the third day." "Ought not Christ " to have suffered these things, and to enter into " his glory ?" [1]

The portion of scripture, of which part was before considered, must now be proceeded with. When any man attentively reads the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah; the question almost irresistibly forces itself upon him: " Of whom speaketh the " prophet this ? of himself, or of some other man ?" [2] I do not know that the prophet was ever supposed to have spoken of *himself:* so it is needless to dwell on the absurdity of such a supposition. Nor does it appear that any individual has been pointed out in whom the prophecy was, or will be, fulfilled.

Extracts are given by Dr. Whitby, on the eighth chapter of Acts, from ancient Jewish writers, maintaining, that the prophecy relates to the Messiah: but modern Jews do not admit this, and cannot be supposed to do it. We only request to know, of whom, or of what company, or of what transactions, it is either a prediction or a history? As a part of " the oracles of God committed to" the Jewish people, and owned by them to be ' the ' word of God;' it must have some important meaning, and we would gladly be informed what they suppose that meaning to be? When this is fairly and clearly stated, I trust learned Christians will give it a candid and impartial consideration. But we do not live in an age, in which *silence* and *imposed restraints,* on such a subject, will produce

[1] Luke ix. 22. xxiv. 25—27. 44—47. [2] Acts viii. 34.

any other effect than a conclusion in the minds of men in general, that the Jews are conscious of being totally unable to disprove the Christian interpretation of the prophecy? though determined not to accede to it.

Some writers, as I recollect, have, in a general and indefinite way, asserted that the *nation* of Israel was intended, and not any *individual*: but it is almost self-evident that this interpretation cannot be maintained, or even rendered plausible, by any genius or learning of man. Let us, however, proceed to examine some parts of it.— "Surely he hath "borne our griefs, and carried "our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, "smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was "wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised "for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace "was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. "All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have "turned every one to his own way, and the Lord "hath laid" (or, *caused to meet*) upon him the "iniquities of us all."[1] It is undeniable that in these verses the writer speaks of *many* sinning, and exposed to suffering, and of *one* as suffering for their sins; and that, by *his* suffering the punishment which they had deserved, *they* are delivered and healed. Now, if the nation of Israel be the sufferer, considered as one person; who are they for whose transgressions Israel was wounded and bruised? Such language can never mean, that Israel suffered for his own sins; nor, that one generation of Israel suffered for the sins of other

[1] Is. liii. 4—6.

generations; because their sufferings could not be "the chastisement of their peace," or avail for "the healing of former generations."—And what generation of Israel ever suffered for the sins of their fathers, being themselves *innocent* and *deserving no sufferings?* Neither will it be allowed by the Jews themselves, that Israel suffered for the sins, and in order to the salvation, of the gentiles, or of any part of them. In short, it does not appear that any meaning, even *specious* meaning, can be given to the passage, except by supposing Israel, or some other collective body, confessing their guilt, and speaking of some *individual*, who suffered the punishment due to them, in order that they might be pardoned and saved. Supposing the prophet, for argument's sake, (I do not adduce it as *authority*,) to mean the company, of whom St. John speaks in the Revelation, who say to "the Lamb that had "been slain," "Thou hast redeemed us to God "with thy blood, out of every kindred, and "tongue, and people, and nation:" suppose the prophet, I say, to mean this company, and himself as one of it, when he says, "All we, like "sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every "one to his own way; and JEHOVAH has made "to meet on him the iniquities of us all:" can any other interpretation be adduced, which will bear a competition with this? In Isaiah is a lock, the wards of which are so intricate that no key can be found to open it: till at length one is brought from the apostle John, which with perfect ease opens it, at the first touch. Was not this the *key* originally intended for that *lock?*

"He was oppressed, and he was afflicted:" (more exactly, "It was exacted, and he became "answerable:") "He was led as a lamb to the "slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is "dumb, so he opened not his mouth. He was "taken from prison and from judgment; and "who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living." Here the person, who was "bruised for the iniquities" of the company spoken of, of whom their "debt was "exacted and he became answerable," is represented as suffering in meekness, patience, and silence, and not murmuring or complaining; though hurried to execution without judgment, and without any one to appear in his behalf; and not only as suffering grievously in other respects, but as "*cut off from the land of the living:*" "for "the transgression of my people was he stricken." If the Messiah be intended, it is manifest that he was not only to be a sufferer, a meek, harmless, and patient sufferer, under oppression and iniquity; but *to die* also, and by *a violent death*, as paying a debt, which he did not contract; as "stricken for the transgression" of that people whom the prophet, or Almighty God, owns as his people. Who can help, in this connexion, recollecting the language of Gabriel to Daniel; "Messiah the Prince shall be cut off, but not "for himself?"[1] Different methods have been adopted of evading our conclusion from Daniel's prophecy; but what method can be taken of escaping the same conclusion from Isaiah's? In-

[1] Is. liii. Dan. ix. 25, 26.

admissible as Mr. C.'s interpretation of Daniel has been shown to be; he probably cannot adduce any thing, even so plausible as that is, in respect of Isaiah's words.

"And he made his grave with the wicked, and "with the rich in his death; because he had done "no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath "put him to grief." Here the *innocence* of the sufferer also is attested; yet, notwithstanding this "it PLEASED JEHOVAH to bruise him." He suffered unto death, and was *buried*. Dying as a malefactor, "he made his grave with the wicked." "A grave was appointed for him among the "wicked; but with a rich man in his death." Every one knows the Christian interpretation: namely, that Jesus was interred in the sepulchre of Joseph, instead of being buried with the malefactors, in the grave appointed for them. And is not this singular coincidence of the event, with the obscure words of the prophet, a proof that this was intended by the Spirit of prophecy? Or what other interpretation has any man to propose, which can stand the competition with it?

'That his grave should be "appointed with the 'wicked," (which was the case of those who suf-'fered as criminals,) but that "he should be 'joined with the rich in his death," are circum-'stances which, before they happened, it was 'very improbable should ever concur in the same 'person.' (*Campbell.*)

But how was it that it should "please the Lord "to bruise him," &c.? What follows answers the question. "When thou shalt make his soul

" an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he " shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the " Lord shall prosper in his hand." Nothing can be plainer than that the person here spoken of, when " *cut off from the land of the living*," when he ' suffered, and died, and was buried,' would be considered by JEHOVAH as a *propitiatory* sacrifice; and therefore as bearing the guilt imputed to him, and the punishment, due to those in behalf of whom he suffered. And therefore as the Lord every where in the law speaks of the typical atonements, and of the smell of the burning victims, as " a sweet savour;" because this was a display of his righteous hatred of sin, and determination so to punish it in the sufferings of the person here spoken of; JEHOVAH is said to " take pleasure in " bruising him, and in putting him to grief, and " making his soul an offering for sin:" that is, he took pleasure in the display thus made of his glorious holiness and justice, as connected with " the praise of the glory of his grace." This accords to the language of the apostle: " Christ " hath given himself for us, an offering and a " sacrifice to God of a sweet smelling savour." [1]

It is equally manifest that the person predicted, after " having been cut off from the land of the " living," and after having been buried, " should " see his seed, and prolong his days, and that the " pleasure of the Lord should prosper in his hand." But how could this be except he *rose again*? " Christ died for our sins according to the scrip- " tures; and was buried, and rose again on the

[1] Eph. v. 2.

third day, according to the scriptures."[1] Let another interpretation, equally satisfactory, be given by those who reject this: and let them not suppose that "the oracles of God" have no meaning.

"He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by the knowledge of him shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities." The person spoken of is here called "the righteous servant of JEHOVAH;" this wholly excludes the idea of an individual, or nation, suffering for *personal* or *national* transgression. It is declared that "he shall bear the iniquity of those whom he *justifies*." Not only would he suffer to exempt them from suffering; but their iniquity should be imputed to him, and laid on him, as on the legal sacrifices. Thus he could "justify many;" or entitle them to the reward of righteousness, "by the knowledge of him;" which is equivalent, in this view, to believing in him: and as this was his great object in thus suffering and dying, he would, in justifying many, "see of the travail" (or agony) of his soul, when God "made his soul a sacrifice for sin;") and "be satisfied;" like the mother, who, "as soon as she is delivered, remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world."

"Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong: because he hath poured out his soul unto death; and he was numbered with the

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.

" transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and " made intercession for the transgressors." Here the fact, of the *death* of the person predicted, is again repeated in emphatical language; to shew the certainty of that event, which would be so incredible to the persons immediately concerned. It is also stated, that he would not only die *a violent death*, but that this death would not be in war, not by assassination, not by a private murder, but by an ignominious execution; being " *num-* " *bered with malefactors.*"—It is likewise repeated, that " he bare the sin of many;" so that, while in the sight of man he died as a *justly condemned malefactor*, in the sight of God he was regarded as a spotless sacrifice, atoning for the sins of others. In consequence of this, implying as before his resurrection, it is added; " he made " intercession for the transgressors." " It is " Christ that died, yea rather is risen again, who " is even at the right hand of God, who also " maketh intercession for us."[1] I do not quote this passage as authority; but merely to shew, with what exactness and ease the language of the apostle interprets the words of the prophet.

Consider Satan, then, as the great and powerful enemy of God, and as lording it over our fallen race: how obvious is it to interpret the beginning of the verse, to predict the effects of the sufferings, death, resurrection, and intercession of the person predicted; when the serpent and his seed, having " bruised his heel," he began immediately to crush the serpent's head; and to rescue millions

[1] Rom. viii. 34.

of wretched slaves from Satan's destructive bondage? "Who hath delivered us from the power "of darkness, and hath translated us into the "kingdom of his dear Son; in whom we have re-"demption through his blood, even the forgive-"ness of sins."[1] "Thus he saw his seed;" for these redeemed persons are "counted to him for "a generation," or progeny.—But I by no means intend to give an adequate comment on the chapter: I would merely touch on some prominent particulars; shewing, what must be found in the person and the facts, which fulfil such a prophecy. It is not requisite to enlarge on the Christian interpretation. No other even plausible interpretation has yet been given; nor does it appear possible that any should be given; for nothing can be more remote from such a completion *in the* MESSIAH, than the expectations of the Jews are at present.

I would only add, that it is by no means sufficient, in order to subvert the argument from this prophecy, concerning the Messiah, that he would suffer, and die by a public execution as a malefactor, in man's esteem, but in reality as a sacrifice for sin; and would rise from the dead, become an intercessor, "justify many," and set up a kingdom on the ruins of the usurped dominion of Satan; it is, I say, wholly insufficient to subvert this argument, to make objections, to propose other readings or translations; or to argue in a way of speculation against it. Another, and more satisfactory interpretation must be adduced, or nothing

[1] Col. i. 13, 14.

to the purpose can be done. The grand outline must be otherwise interpreted, or our interpretation must be admitted, and at least silently allowed to be unanswerable; a very common and convenient way of disposing of unanswerable books, and by far the best way, in policy, of leaving them to fall into oblivion.

Did this prophecy stand single in the scriptures, there might be some ground for hesitation as to the *strong* conclusions to be drawn from it: but this is so far from being the case, that a history of our Lord's sufferings, and death, and even the minute circumstances of it, might be compiled in the very words of the ancient prophets; only, on some occasions substituting the preterite for the future.

We will therefore now proceed to take a concise view of another remarkable prophecy. The twenty-second Psalm opens with the very words which our Lord used on the cross, only substituting the Syriac or Chaldee word for the Hebrew; *Sabachthani*, for עֲזַבְתָּנִי: "My God, my God, "why hast thou forsaken me." This might be less remarkable, were not the coincidence at the beginning carried throughout, in language which never suited any other person; nor is there the least probability that it ever will. It is not necessary that every part of the Psalm should be gone through: The speaker in it says, "But I am a "worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and "despised of the people. All they that see me "laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they "shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord "that he would deliver him; let him deliver him,

"seeing he delighted in him." This might indeed be in some sense spoken by David, especially in respect of the ill usage, with which he met from Israel, during Absalom's rebellion. Yet the language is more energetic, than even that usage warranted; and it was not literally fulfilled: for, though enemies at a distance spake and acted most cruelly and contumeliously to David; all who approached him, except Shimei, treated him with great respect and affection. But who, that has read the New Testament, can help perceiving how exactly and literally it was fulfilled while Jesus hung on the cross? "They that passed by "reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, "Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it "in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son "of God, come down from the cross. Likewise "also the chief priests mocking him, with the "scribes and elders, said, He saved others, him-"self he cannot save. If he be the King of "Israel, let him now come down from the cross, "and we will believe him. He trusted in God: "let him deliver him, if he will have him; for he "said, I am the Son of God. The thieves also, "who were crucified with him, cast the same in "his teeth."[1] This concurrence of the rude multitude with those in authority, with the principal ministers of religion, and with the most learned men of the nation, in reviling and insulting a poor sufferer on a cross; joined with the insults of his fellow sufferers; is unparalleled in the history of mankind: but it most exactly fulfilled the pro-

[1] Psalm xxii. 6—8. Matt. xxvii. 39—44.

phecy under consideration, as well as many others to the same purpose.—" In my adversity they re-
" joiced, and gathered themselves together: yea,
" the very *abjects* gathered themselves together."[1] Nothing occurs in the history of David like this: nor indeed can any instance be produced, in which the prophecy before us received a *literal* interpretation, except in the history of Jesus of Nazareth. It is also remarkable, that the Psalm contains no confession of sin, or any thing in the least intimating the criminality of the sufferer: whereas David, in all the other Psalms written during the calamities which he suffered from Absalom, continually recurs to the sins which had occasioned them. So far from this, the speaker uses words concerning himself, which no mere man could in strict propriety use. " Thou didst
" make me to hope, when I was upon my mother's
" breasts."

Again, " Many bulls have compassed me;
" strong bulls of Bashan have beset me round:
" they gaped upon me with their mouths, as a
" ravening and a roaring lion. I am poured out
" like water; and all my bones are out of joint:
" my heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst
" of my body: my strength is dried up like a
" potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws;
" and thou hast brought me into *the dust of*
" *death*."[2] David was never thus surrounded by powerful and fierce enemies, till brought down to " the dust of death:" on the contrary, he was, in his severest trials, surrounded by faithful friends

[1] Psalm xxxv. 15. [2] Psalm xxii. 12—15.

and followers, who valued his life more than their own; and he lived to triumph over all enemies, and ended his life in great honour and prosperity. But "consider Jesus," surrounded not only by insulting multitudes, not only by the powerful chief priests, rulers, and scribes, but also by the Roman soldiers; scourged, mocked, crowned with thorns, nailed to the cross; the raising up of which, and placing it in its foot, shook or dislocated his bones; parched with thirst, fainting in languor and anguish; and at length expiring; and you have a most striking accomplishment of a most extraordinary prediction: nor can any other example be adduced from universal history, which accords to it, in a similar manner. Sufferers in extremity are commonly compassionated, if not by the rude multitude, yet by superior persons: or, if the superiors be hardened against them, the people often sympathize with them. This has almost always been the case, with martyrs in general; but it was not the case of Jesus the Nazarene: even his disciples forsook him, and were afraid to own him.

"For dogs have compassed me; the assembly "of the wicked hath inclosed me; they pierced "my hands and my feet: I may tell all my bones; "they look and stare upon me.—"Of whom "speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of "some other man?" Of what other man? Of Jesus, and of him only.

It is true that in the Hebrew text, the clause rendered, "They pierced my hands and my feet," stands, "As a lion, my hands and my feet." But this contains no clear meaning at all. The Sep-

tuagint, which is certainly more ancient than the Christian era, and the work of Jews, evidently read it, as we do, (ὤρυξαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας) "they "dug my hands and my feet." Some indeed think the word compounded of כָּרָה and אַרְיֵה; and that it means "They dug as a lion my hands;" &c.: but it does not appear how this construction can be maintained. It is more obvious to allow, that a trivial alteration has taken place in the text, through the error of some ancient transcriber. But, however that may be, "the hands "and the feet" of the sufferer were especially affected, and no punishment, yet invented by the cruel ingenuity of man, ever so affected "the "hands and the feet" as crucifixion, by nailing them to the cross, and suspending, in great measure, if not wholly, the weight of the body on the nails thus driven through those exquisitely sensible parts of the human frame.

It may be doubted whether crucifixion were originally a *Roman* punishment, but it was not used in Israel. The "hanging on a tree," mentioned in the scripture, was suspension of the dead corpse after execution; or, perhaps, sometimes death by suspension, or strangulation: and there can scarcely be a reasonable doubt, that the Holy Spirit, speaking by the Psalmist, pointed out the special manner of the Messiah's death, above a thousand years before the Christian era.

"They part my garments among them, and "they cast lots upon my vesture."[1] Three of the Gospels, in which the fulfilment of this pre-

[1] Ps. xxii. 18. Matt. xxvii. 35. Mark xv. 24. Luke xxiii. 34. John xix. 23, 24.

diction stands recorded, were extant at an early period; when either Jews or Romans might have denied the fact if they had been able: yet this was never done. The singular circumstance, that while the other garments of Jesus were divided into portions, his vesture should be so formed, that the soldiers rather chose to cast lots for it, than to rend it, is worthy of special notice: for, whatever any others, concerned in these transactions might be supposed to do, from regard to the predictions of the prophets; the Roman soldiers cannot be imagined to have regulated their conduct by them. Thus the prophetic history becomes more and more *circumstantial:* and in whom was it ever realized, except in Jesus of Nazareth? Have then the words of the Psalmist any meaning? and what is that meaning, if it be not that which Christians maintain? Still the simile recurs: a lock of such intricate and complicated wards, that no key but one, can be found, however forcibly applied, to move it; and that one opens it by a touch. Is not this the key which was made for the lock? Who can reasonably doubt it?

"But be not thou far from me: O Lord, my "strength, haste thee to help me. Deliver my "soul from the *sword*, thy darling from the power "of the dog." (YACHADIKA; *thy only One, unicus, unigenitus.*) *Robertson.* Τὴν μονογενῆ μου, my only *begotten, femin. Sept.* The substantive is masculine, and the pronoun is the second person, in the original. The translators, probably, supposed the word to coincide with *my soul;* but the idea of *only begotten* is recognized.—"Save me from the

"lions' mouth; for thou hast heard me from the "horns of the unicorns." [1]

Immediately after this, he who had complained in such doleful lamentations, and who had been "brought *into the dust of death*," bursts forth in a most triumphant manner: the last clause quoted being somewhat such a connecting step to transition from the depth of suffering and debasement, to the glory which followed, as our Lord's last words on the cross were: "Father, into thy hands "I commend my spirit."—"I will declare thy "name unto my brethren;[2] in the midst of the "congregation will I praise thee.—Ye that fear "the Lord, praise him. All ye seed of Jacob, "glorify him; and fear him, all ye seed of Israel: "for he hath not despised nor abhorred the "affliction of the afflicted, neither hath he hid "his face from him; but when he cried unto him "he heard." [3]

"My praise shall be of thee in the great con-"gregation; I will pay my vows before them that "fear him. The meek shall eat and be satisfied; "they shall praise the Lord that seek him; your "heart shall live for ever." [4]

Who can read these verses, as compared with the preceding part of the Psalm, without being reminded of the risen Saviour conversing with his disciples; and commissioning the apostles to preach to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem; and of their addresses and exhortations to the Jews, before they turned to the gentiles? [5] Espe-

[1] Ps. xxii. 19, 20.
[2] Heb. v. 7.
[3] John xvii. 6, 26.
[4] Ps. xxii. 22—26.
[5] Acts xiii. 26, 38, 39.

cially what can be made of the clause, as referred to David, or any other person, than Jesus—"The "meek shall eat and be satisfied—your heart shall "live for ever?"[1] Let the reader carefully and impartially compare with this clause the scripture referred to, and he must be struck with the coincidence.

Hitherto, however, Israel exclusively may be considered as spoken of; but the next verse predicts the conversion of the gentiles all over the earth, as our Lord intimated, when certain Greeks wanted to see him: "And I, if I be lifted up from "the earth, will draw all men to me. This he "said, signifying what death he should die."[2] Thus the prophecy; All the ends of the earth shall "remember themselves, and shall turn unto the "Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall "worship before him: for the kingdom is the "Lord's and he is the governor among the people. "All that be fat upon earth shall eat and worship; "all that go down to the dust, shall bow before "him;[3] and none can keep alive" (or *make alive*) "his own soul. A seed shall serve him, it shall "be accounted to the Lord for a generation."[4] What can these verses mean, if referred to David, or to any other than the Messiah?—to him, of whom Isaiah says, "He shall be called the ever-"lasting Father," (or the Father of the everlasting age,) and whom the apostle calls "The second "Adam, the Lord from heaven;" from whom all the true church derive spiritual and eternal life, as all men derive natural life from the first Adam?

[1] John vi. 48—58. [2] John xii. 20—33.
[3] Phil. ii. 8—11. [4] Ps. xxii. 27—30.

This concurs with what was before adduced from Isaiah; "He shall see of the travail of his soul, "and be satisfied." "He shall see his seed."[1] With evident reference to this, the apostle applies to the Christian church many of those things, which were spoken of Israel by the Lord: "Ye "are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a "holy nation, a peculiar people."[2] And can it be said, that the words of the Psalmist, connected with the preceding verses, do not warrant this application?—"They shall come, and shall declare "his righteousness, unto a people that shall be "born; that the Lord hath done this."[3]

Thus the Psalm contains a regular prediction, which has received an exact accomplishment, even to *minuteness*, in "the sufferings of Christ, "and the glory which followed;" except that which remains to be fulfilled, when "the kingdoms "of this world shall become the kingdoms of our "Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for "ever and ever."[4] If this most obvious and easy interpretation be rejected; let another be produced, not of a few expressions, but of the *whole prophecy*, which can stand a competition with it. Till this be done, our interpretation must be conceded to be the true one.

A few extracts alone, from other productions, must now be adduced; which corroborate our interpretation of these scriptures, which have been more fully examined. The sixty-ninth Psalm

[1] Is. ix. 5. liii. 10—12.
[2] 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10.
[3] Ps. xxii. 31.
[4] Rev. xi. 15.

might be shewn to be throughout a prophecy of the Messiah; fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, and in the judgments which came upon the Jews, because they rejected and crucified him. But, as I mean only to call the attention of the reader to these prophecies, and not to write an exposition of them, I shall merely quote one passage: "Re- "proach hath broken my heart, and I am full of "heaviness; and I looked for some to take pity, "but there was none; and for comforters, but I "found none. They gave me also gall to eat, "and when I was thirsty they gave me vinegar "to drink."[1] David was indeed often extremely ill-treated, both by Saul and his adherents, and in Absalom's rebellion: but when was he destitute of faithful adherents and affectionate comforters? When was this the case with any one of whom we read in scripture, except Job, who was a remarkable type of the Messiah? The literal fulfilment of the latter verse, in Jesus of Nazareth, is well known; and the persons concerned assuredly did not intend to fulfil the scriptures.[2]

Again, in Isaiah, One says, "Wherefore when "I came, was there no man? when I called, was "there none to answer? Is my hand shortened, "that it cannot redeem, or have I no power to "deliver? I clothe the heavens with blackness; "I make sackcloth their covering.[3]—The Lord "God hath given me the tongue of the learned, "that I should know how to speak a word in season "to him that is weary. He wakeneth morning

[1] Ps. lix. 20, 21. [2] Matt. xxvii. 34, 48. John xix. 28, 29.
[3] Matt. xxvii. 43.

" by morning, he wakeneth my ear to hear as the " learned. The Lord God hath opened mine ear,[1] " and I was not rebellious, neither turned away " back. I gave my back to the smiters, and my " cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; I hid " not my face from shame and spitting. For the " Lord God will help me."[2]

Let the reader carefully observe, that the person who speaks throughout is the same, without the least intimation of a change: and who was this person, who united such divine dignity, authority, and power; so much meekness and condescension in teaching and comforting the weary; and such submission to the most contemptuous and cruel usage, with full confidence of victory and triumph? Who but he that " endured the cross, despising " the shame, and is set down at the right hand of " the throne of God?" In whom was this prediction ever fulfilled, but in Jesus of Nazareth? Let the fulfilment of it in any other person be adduced, if there ever was any. It is a prophecy of a divine Messiah, IMMANUEL; who was treated with indignity and opprobrium, and who triumphed over all. And the second verse shews the reason why the Jews have, during so many ages, been, as it were, divorced from the Lord. " Wherefore when I came, was there no man? " when I called, was there none to answer?" For according to the evangelist, "He came to his own, " and his own received him not."[3]

The prophecy of Daniel has already been considered, in another part of the general argument;

[1] Psalm xl. 6. [2] Is. l. 1—9. [3] John i. 11.

and I am persuaded that the Christian interpretation has been confirmed, not indeed beyond *contradiction*, but beyond all *refutation*.—I shall here only call the reader's attention to the language employed, in respect "of Messiah the Prince," who should be "cut off, but not for himself." Our argument does not rest on the words, "not "for himself." It is undeniable, that "Messiah "the Prince," there spoken of, would, according to the prophet, "be cut off;" that is, die by violence, and not a natural death: while the language previously used, coinciding, as that expression does, with the words of Isaiah, shews that, while he died, in man's esteem, as a criminal, he suffered in reality, not as a martyr, but as an ATONING SACRIFICE for sin: "To make an end of sins," or of sin-offerings, "and to make reconciliation for "iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteous-"ness."[1] How could this be verified in 'king 'Agrippa,' or in any other man, of whom the records of history make mention?

Again, Of whom does the prophet Zechariah speak, or rather JEHOVAH by him? "I will pour "upon the house of David, and upon the inhabi-"tants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and sup-"plications, and they shall look *on me*, whom they "have pierced; and they shall mourn for him, as "one mourneth for his only Son." The Christian interpretation is known. It is Immanuel, who speaks of the Jews, whose ancestors "pierced his "hands and feet," his temples and his side, by the "Roman soldiers employed in mocking and cru-

[1] Dan. ix. 24. Is. liii. 10—12.

cifying him; whose blood the Jews imprecated "upon them and their children;" and whose posterity have, in every age consented, with full approbation, to the deed of their fathers;[1] thus "crucifying the Son of God afresh, and putting "him to open shame:"[2] but who will ere long, by the "pouring out of the Spirit upon them," look to him with intensely penitent sorrow, and with obedient faith and love. May the Lord speedily vouchsafe this "pouring out of the "Spirit" on Israel; and thus, according to another prophecy, "take away the stony heart out of "their flesh, and give them a heart of flesh."[3]

I shall close this part with another prediction from the same prophet. "Awake, O sword, "against my Shepherd, against the Man that is "my Fellow, saith the Lord of hosts; smite the "Shepherd." Who is this person, whom JEHOVAH owns as "his SHEPHERD?" not as one of his shepherds, much less an idol-shepherd, but exclusively his Shepherd? and "the Man," the only Man, who is "his FELLOW?" is it not Immanuel? whose "name is Wonderful, Counsellor, the "mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince "of Peace?"[4] Is it not he of whom another prophet speaks, "I will set one Shepherd over them, "and he shall feed them, even my servant David; "he shall feed them, he shall be their Shepherd, "and I the Lord will be their God; and my servant "David, a Prince among them: I the Lord have

[1] Matt. xxvii. 25. John xix. 37. Heb. vi. 6.
[2] συνευδοκεῖτε, Luke xi. 48. [3] Ezek. xi. 19, 20. xxxvi. 25—27.
[4] Is. vii. 14. ix. 6, 7.

spoken it?"[1] Is it not he, of whom Micah prophesies: "Out of thee" (Bethlehem) "shall he come "forth *unto me*, that is to be Ruler in Israel: "WHOSE GOINGS FORTH HAVE BEEN FROM OF OLD, "FROM EVERLASTING.—And he shall stand and feed, "in the strength of the LORD, in the majesty of "the name of the Lord his God: and they shall "abide: for now shall he be great unto the ends "of the earth?"[2] Surely this is He, whom JEHOVAH calls "My SHEPHERD: the Man that is "my FELLOW." Could this language be used with truth of any other shepherd? Where do we read any thing like it of David, or any of those who fed Israel most faithfully? No, here is "THE "GOOD Shepherd, who laid down his life for the "sheep:" "THE GREAT Shepherd," who made our peace "by the blood of the everlasting cove-"nant;" "Yea, THE CHIEF Shepherd, who shall "appear" to judge the world.[3]

But what does "the Lord of hosts" say concerning this his Shepherd? "Awake, O sword, "against my Shepherd.—Smite the Shepherd." How can this be? The sword, which JEHOVAH calls to *awake*, must be that of avenging justice. Why must this "sword smite his Shepherd?" Let Isaiah answer the question: "He was wounded "for our transgressions; he was bruised for our "iniquities.—All we, like sheep, have gone astray, "we have turned every one to his own way; and "the Lord hath caused to meet on him the ini-"quity of us all." "It pleased the Lord to bruise "him: he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt

[1] Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24. [2] Micah v. 2—5.
[3] John x. 11.—14. Heb. xiii. 19, 20. 1 Pet. v. 4.

" make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his " seed; he shall prolong his days; and the " pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand."[1]

Have we then no ground in the Old Testament to conclude, that the promised Messiah would, when he came, be rejected, despised, hated, persecuted, put to death as a malefactor, even crucified; yet die as an atoning sacrifice for sin? Certainly these things ought not to be passed over in silence, or without notice, by him who would disprove the Messiahship of Jesus the Nazarene. Certainly these prophecies must *all* be satisfactorily explained in another meaning; or else our appeal to the Old Testament cannot be set aside or resisted.—Indeed I have by no means brought forward all the proof of this from the Old Testament: but, when what I have adduced has been disposed of, some other Christian writer, (for my age and infirmities exclude the thought of my attempting it,) will cut out for the answerer further employment; if that ever be needful, which indeed I do not think it will be.

Our next particular has been so far anticipated, that little remains to be done.

III. It is predicted in the Old Testament, that the Messiah should arise from the dead, and ascend into heaven; and that most glorious effects would follow his ascension and exaltation.

They, however, for whose benefit I chiefly write, if once convinced of those facts concerning the Messiah which have been stated, will not require much proof of this particular; and, without this

[1] Is. liii.

conviction, all proof must be disregarded: it therefore is not requisite to enlarge upon it.

The passage in the sixteenth Psalm can never admit of any other interpretation. "I have set "the Lord always before me: because he is at "my right hand, I shall not be moved. Therefore "my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; my "flesh also shall rest in hope: for thou wilt not "leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer "thy holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt shew "me the path of life."[1] The person here speaking evidently considers himself as one who was about to die and be *buried*; "My flesh shall rest in "hope." His soul would go into *Hades*, שְׁאוֹל the *unseen world*, but would not be left there; his body would be a *corpse*, but it would "not see "corruption;" that is, not remain dead so long as to begin to putrefy and return to the dust. On the contrary, he was confident that he should arise, not to remain on earth, and die a second time, as those who were raised by miracle did; but that he should be shewn the path of life; and enter the presence of God, "where is fulness of joy, and "pleasures at his right hand for evermore."—Now in what other person were all these particulars ever verified, except in Jesus of Nazareth, "the "Holy One of God?"—But I forbear: the apostle's argument is so conclusive, and it proved so efficacious, that I need only adduce it; not as *authority*; but as *an argument*, requiring an answer, in the same manner as *my* arguments may do: for I expect a Jew to consider it in the same

[1] Ps. xvi. 8—11.

light.—"Men and brethren, let me freely speak "unto you of the patriarch David; that he is both "dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us "unto this day. Therefore, being a prophet, and "knowing that God had sworn with an oath unto "him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to "the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his "throne: he, seeing this before, spake of the re-"surrection of Christ; that his soul was not left "in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption."—In like manner, another apostle says; "He saith, "Thou shalt not suffer thy holy one to see corrup-"tion. For David, after he had served his gen-"eration by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was "laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption: but he "whom God raised again, saw no corruption."[1]

Indeed, every prediction of the glorious and enduring kingdom of the Messiah, when once it is established that a Messiah was predicted who should bleed and die, immediately becomes a demonstration of his resurrection. Intimations of this are given in several other scriptures, as, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead "body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye "that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the "dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth her "dead." Who here speaks? Even he who "is "risen from the dead, and become the first fruits" of the resurrection; who said, "I am the Resur-"rection and the Life!"[2]

It is also foretold in the scriptures that the Messiah should ascend into heaven, as introduc-

[1] Acts ii. 30—32. xiii. 34—37. [2] Is. xxvi. 19. John xi. 25. 1 Cor. xv. 20. See also Hos. vi. 2. xiii. 14.

tory to the grand establishment of his kingdom. "Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led cap- "tivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men; "yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord "God might dwell among them."—Who is this, who, ascending on high, and leading captivity captive, *received* gifts for men? If JEHOVAH, from whom did he *receive* them? Yet the whole context speaks of JEHOVAH. If not JEHOVAH, who is intended? Of whom are these things spoken? Is not the apostle's application of the passage, far more obvious and reasonable than any other which can be adduced or imagined?—"Wherefore he "saith, when he ascended up on high, he led cap- "tivity captive, and gave gifts to men. Now that "he ascended, what is it but that he also descended "first into the lower parts of the earth? He "that descended is the same also that ascended "up far above all heavens, that he might fill "all things. And he gave some apostles, and "some prophets, and some evangelists, and some "pastors and teachers, &c."[1] "Therefore being "by the right hand of God exalted, and having "received of the Father the promise of the Holy "Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now "see and hear. For David is not ascended into "the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord "said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, "until I make thy foes thy footstool."[2]

I do not expect, that Jews should receive these quotations from the New Testament as the word of God; but can they deny that they are at least

[1] Ps. lxviii. 18. Eph. iv. 8—12 [2] Ps. cx. 1, 2. Acts ii. 33—35.

very *apposite* and probable expositions of texts, which scarcely admit of any other intelligible interpretation?

The consequence of the Messiah's sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension, and exaltation, as "a Priest upon his throne," at the right hand of the Father; in respect of those, whether Jews or gentiles, who were "his people, willing in the day "of his power;" has already appeared, in that part of the work in which the effects of the coming of Jesus are considered. Far more might indeed be added, concerning the predictions which clearly foretold these effects, and connected them with his humiliation: and something has been adduced, on the fifty-third of Isaiah and on the twenty-second Psalm, to this effect. But I would now hasten to a close.

I have only one more subject to adduce, which must not by any means be passed over; yet I mention it with a kind of trepidation; lest I should seem, as a gentile, 'to boast over the 'Jews,' or not to have suitable candour and good will towards them. But the facts are undeniable; namely, the desolations of Jerusalem and the temple in less than forty years after the crucifixion of Jesus; with the unspeakable miseries endured by the Jews, and the incredible slaughter made of them, during the siege of Jerusalem, as recorded by their own historian Josephus; and their despised and oppressed condition ever since, for above seventeen hundred years. These facts have exceedingly perplexed the Jews themselves; and they cannot account for it, that their sufferings,

since the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, have continued so much longer than the Babylonish captivity did; though they had not previously been guilty of any direct idolatry. It would however answer little purpose, here to assign the reasons of this most extraordinary event, from the writings of Christians, or even from those contained in the New Testament: but it is of the highest consequence to call the attention of the Jews to what their own prophets spake on this subject.

It is the design of these testimonies, to ascertain indisputably what has been the *real cause* of these dire and long continued judgments of God on his ancient people; by shewing the manner in which some of the prophets connect the rejection, sufferings, and death of the Messiah, with the desolations of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the Jews.—Thus Gabriel says to Daniel: "After "threescore and two weeks, Messiah shall be cut "off, but not for himself: and the people of the "prince that shall come shall destroy the city and "the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be "with a flood, and to the end of the war desola-"tions are determined. And he shall confirm the "covenant with many for one week; and in the "midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice "and the oblation to cease. And for the over-"spreading of abominations he shall make it "desolate, even until the consummation, and that "determined shall be poured upon the desolate."[1]

What attentive and impartial reader can help

[1] Dan. x. 26, 27.

seeing and acknowledging, in this prophecy, the connexion between "the Messiah being cut off," and the predicted desolations? Is it not here expressly foretold, that the coming of the Messiah, and his sufferings and death, would eventually *occasion*, at least, the desolations of Jerusalem, the termination of the temple-service, the awful miseries inflicted on the Jews by the idolatrous Romans, and the introduction of their permanent dispersion? And did not these events follow speedily after the Jews had cut off our Lord Jesus Christ? It is in vain to criticise on single words or expressions, or to make objections to this or the other explanation: nothing but an interpretation of THE WHOLE PROPHECY, and of every clause, in another more satisfactory manner; grounded, as ours is, on *known and undeniable facts;* can do any thing effectual to obviate the conclusion, that Jesus is the Messiah; and that, by rejecting and crucifying him, and cruelly persecuting his disciples, the nation of the Jews filled up that measure of iniquity, which brought upon them their past and present sufferings.—"O Jerusalem, Jerusa-
"lem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest
"them which are sent unto thee, how often would
"I have gathered thy children, even as a hen
"gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye
"would not! Behold, your house is left unto
"you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not
"see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is
"he that cometh in the name of the Lord."[1] These calamities therefore will last, till the "Spirit

[1] Matt. xxiii. 34—39.

"of grace and of supplications be poured upon "them, and they shall look" with penitent sorrow "and genuine faith on him whom they pierced," and have crucified afresh through all succeeding generations. But then the "fountain for sin and "uncleanness shall be opened for them." For in that day, when God shall restore Israel, they shall thus look unto him whom they pierced.[1]

Another prophecy of Zechariah must here again be adduced. "Awake, O sword, against my "Shepherd, against the Man that is my Fellow, "saith the Lord of hosts. Smite the Shepherd, "and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn "my hand upon the little ones. And it shall "come to pass, that in all the land two parts "thereof shall be cut off and die, but the third "shall be left therein. And I will bring the "third part through the fire; and I will refine "them as silver is refined, and will try them as "gold is tried; and they shall call on my name, "and I will hear them. I will say, It is my "people, and they shall say, The Lord is my "God.—Behold the day of the Lord cometh, and "thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee: "and I will gather all nations against Jerusalem "to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the "houses rifled, and the women ravished; and "half the city shall go forth into captivity; and "the residue of the people shall not be cut off "from the city."[2]

This passage begins with the death of the Messiah, the Shepherd and Fellow of JEHOVAH; by the

[1] Zech. xii. 10—14. xiii. 1. [2] Zech. xiii. 7—9. xiv. 1, 2.

sword of his avenging justice, yet by the wicked hands of the Jews. It proceeds to shew the terrible vengeance of God on the nation; "two "thirds shall die:" it points out "the remnant "according to the election of grace;" their trials, preservation, and sanctification. It goes on to represent the dreadful siege and taking of Jerusalem; and to intimate that half would be destroyed in the siege, or carried into captivity, and disposed of in different ways. Difficulties may rest on some expressions; but this is the undeniable outline: namely, the sword of JEHOVAH shall first "awake against his Shepherd:" and then against those who murdered his Shepherd; against the nation of the Jews, except a tried remnant; against Jerusalem, where his blood was shed; and finally, against the Roman empire, who had been the instruments, both of crucifying his Shepherd, and destroying Jerusalem and the Jews; not from regard to him, but from ambition, rapacity, revenge, and enmity to the true God and true religion. And can any reflecting and impartial man doubt, whether the past and present sufferings of the Jews were the consequences of rejecting and crucifying their Messiah, and that these events were here predicted?

The Psalmist also concludes a doleful account of his sufferings, in which there is sufficient proof that he spake as the type of the Messiah, by saying, "Reproach hath broken my heart, and I am "full of heaviness: and I looked for some to "take pity, but there was none; and for com-"forters, but I found none. They gave me also "gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave

"me vinegar to drink." He then proceeds, in this awful manner: "Let their table become a "snare before them; and that which should have "been for their welfare, let it become a trap. "Let their eyes be darkened, that they see not; "and make their loins continually to shake. "Pour out thine indignation upon them, and let "thy wrathful anger take hold of them. Let "their habitation be desolate; and let none dwell "in their tents. For they persecute him whom "thou hast smitten," (the Messiah;) "and they "talk to the grief of those whom thou hast "wounded" (his disciples). "Add iniquity to "their iniquity; and let them not come into thy "righteousness. Let them be blotted out of the "book of the living, and not be written with the "righteous."[1]

Many of the passages in the Psalms, which appear as *imprecations*, may perhaps more properly be rendered as *prophecies:* yet in either way they should not be understood as pertaining to the personal enemies of the Psalmist, but to those of the Lord and his Messiah, of whom David was an eminent type. But the passage here quoted is strictly an *imprecation;* several of the verbs being in the imperative: and there is scarcely room for a doubt, but that they denounce sentence against the Jewish nation for rejecting and crucifying their Messiah, and persecuting his apostles and disciples. If, indeed, these words stood alone in this argument, some doubt might be entertained; and an immense difficulty must remain,

[1] Ps. lxix. 20—28.

concerning the speaker, (supposing him inspired by the Holy Spirit;) and the persons intended, and the manner in which the prediction has been fulfilled. Certainly David, according to the history, was, during Absalom's rebellion, by no means disposed thus to *curse* his opponents; and, after its termination, no special judgments fell upon Israel, answerable to such language: and when, on his numbering the people, wrath was upon them, he considered it as the punishment of his own sin, and prayed, "Lo, I have sinned, and "done wickedly: but these sheep, what have "they done? Let thine hand be against me, "and against my father's house."[1] But, when we view the words of the Psalm, in connexion with the clear and express predictions, before considered; their import and fulfilment are evident; and the application of them in the New Testament is fully satisfactory.[2]

Several other prophetical indications to the same effect might be adduced:[3] but these are the most clear and decisive; and they are quite sufficient. I shall however adduce again the words of God by Moses. "I will raise them up a Pro-"phet from among their brethren, like unto "thee; and will put my words in his mouth; "and he shall speak unto them all that I shall "command him: and it shall come to pass, that "whosoever will not hearken unto my words "which he shall speak in my name, I will require "it of him."[4] If the Messiah be meant, and if

[1] 2 Sam. xxiv. 17. [2] Acts i. 20—22. Rom. xi. 7—11.
[3] Mal. iii. 1—4. iv. 1, 4, 5. [4] Deut. xviii. 18, 19. Comp. Acts iii. 22, 23. vii. 35—37. 51—53.

Jesus were the Messiah; there can be no longer any doubt concerning the consequences of the Messiah's coming, and his rejection by the Jews; or concerning the real cause of the long continued calamities of the nation. "Do not think that I "will accuse you to the Father: there is one "that accuseth you; even Moses, in whom ye "trust. For, had ye believed Moses, ye would "have believed me; for he wrote of me. But, "if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye be-"lieve my words?"[1]

Thus, I trust, it has been shewn, that the prophecies of the Old Testament, if read attentively and repeatedly, and carefully compared with each other, by any competent person, who could (if that may be supposed possible,) consider himself wholly unconcerned in the result; would appear to him to predict a Messiah, who would meet with a contemptuous and hostile reception from his own nation; who would, notwithstanding his wisdom, holiness, meekness, and numerous miracles of love and mercy, lead an afflicted and suffering life, and this closed by a violent and ignominious death; by that kind of punishment, which the law pronounced accursed;[2] as a malefactor, in man's estimation, as an atoning sacrifice for sin, in the judgment of God: that, while he died with malefactors, he would be buried in the tomb of a rich man: that, according to the prophets, he would arise from the dead, before his body "began to see corruption:" that "he would

[1] John v. 45—47. See also Matt. xxiii. 34—37. Luke xi. 49—51. xiii. 33—37. 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16.

[2] Gal. iii. 13.

" ascend into heaven" as a triumphant conqueror, to be seated " at the right hand of God:" that in his high exaltation as " a Priest upon his throne," he would establish a glorious, extensive, permanent, and increasing kingdom: and that the immediate effect to the Jewish nation (a remnant excepted,) would be, their rejection for a season from being the peculiar people of God, who would leave " their name as a curse to his chosen; for " the Lord God would slay them, and call his peo- " ple by another name," [1] together with the desolation of Jerusalem and the temple; the termination or, at least, the long-continued interruption of almost the whole ceremonial of Moses; and the dispersion of the wretched remains of the Jews through the nations of the earth.

I have already so often shewn it, that I have not in this part particularly stated what, I firmly believe, such a student of prophecy would conclude from the Old Testament concerning 'the 'restoration of Israel,' through their receiving, in penitent faith and love, their long rejected Messiah; and their subsequent honour and distinction of love and gratitude from all other nations, (now converted to JEHOVAH and his Christ,) as the channels through which all the blessings of true religion and eternal salvation, have flowed to them.

And now, after this whole argument, I can most confidently adopt the apostle's words, " Brethren, " my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, " that they might be saved."—The argument can-

[1] Is. lxv. 15.

not be done justice to, without bringing forward many things which strongly imply blame, to the former and the present generations of the Jews: but God knoweth that this is not done in any self-preference, or disposition to glory over them. There is one thing peculiarly pleasing to me in stating my views to them; that I am not constrained to say with Jeremiah, "I have not de-"sired the woful day, O Lord, thou knowest." I trust "the woful day" with Israel is nearly terminated, and that blessed and glorious times, to that nation especially, though not exclusively, are at hand. It is not likely that I should live to witness them: but it seems to my feeling, as if the knowing of them would add extacy to joy even in heaven; and I should count it one of the greatest honours and pleasures of my life, if any thing I have written should, in the smallest degree, contribute to it. I have not, that I know of, written one line but in the spirit of love; and, in transcribing my rough copy, I have been continually reminded of the words of Pope,

> 'Poets lose half the praise they would have got,
> 'Were it but known what they discreetly blot.

In the eagerness of my natural spirit, many things were put down in the sketch, which they who love controversy would probably have better approved than what I have sent to the press: and I am aware, as in other instances, that the *popularity* of the work will suffer by the suppressions; but not the *usefulness*, which is of infinitely greater importance: and, unless we can defend Christianity and its doctrines in the Christian spirit of meekness and love, we may obtain the

praise of men, but shall not be partakers of "the "honour which cometh from God only." Much I have expunged, lest I should give *needless* or *injurious* offence; and, if any thing remains of this kind, I must intreat a candid construction: for, though convinced that "the fruit of righ- "teousness is sown in peace of those who make "peace," I am not in all cases able to discern what may be inconsistent with this, in what I have written; or to come up to the standard which I would prescribe to myself.

TWO LETTERS

ON

CONFORMITY TO THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH:

WITH

AN ESSAY

ON THE

RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL.

1815—1817.

The following Letters were addressed to the Rev. Peter Roe, Minister of St. Mary's Kilkenny, under circumstances which he himself thus details.

"About the year 1804, the opinions of Robert Browne were revived in Dublin. This person in the year 1581 formed a church on the following principles. 'The members of it maintained the discipline of the Church of England to be popish and antichristian; they forbad their brethren to join with those of her communion in any part of public worship; and they renounced religious intercourse with all reformed churches except such as were of their own model. They considered that every church should be confined within the limits of a single congregation, and its government democratical. The power of admitting or excluding members, and of deciding all controversies, was in the brotherhood. They did not allow the priesthood to be a distinct order, or that it could give a man an indelible character. They declared against all forms of prayer; and any brother had liberty to exhort in their assemblies: and in church discipline they were entirely opposed to every union with the state, or civil power. In short, in their view every society of Christians, or, as they termed it, every *church*, was a distinct body corporate, possessing in itself all powers for regulating and governing its members.'"

The 'division and subdivision' which Mr. Roe witnessed, as produced by the re-appearance of these opinions, which were 'hailed as a new discovery,' and were presented in a way well suited to allure and entangle "the artless, the unwary, and the scrupulous," led him to institute a correspondence with several of his more experienced friends upon the subject: and the answers which he received he, with the consent of the respective writers, published in a pamphlet, entitled, "The Evil of Separation from the Church of England." The first edition, printed at Kilkenny, 1815, contained only the former of the two following letters: the second letter, with the annexed Essay on the Religious Establishment of Israel, was added in the second edition, printed for Seeley, London, 1817.—J. S.

LETTER I.

Aston Sandford, Feb. 10, 1815.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

I lose no time in remitting to you my revised thoughts on the subject of our communication;[1] though I feel, that Horace's caution to his friend is very applicable to the case; which I would also earnestly recommend to the attention of you and your friends.

> 'Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ
> Tractas, et incedis per ignes
> Suppositos cineri doloso.'

Did the whole, indeed, rest with the sentiments of Mr. Haldane and his associates, who are bold innovators on all ancient systems, I should feel less difficulty; because my remarks would involve comparatively a small company; and those not entitled to peculiar delicacy of opposition, of which they by no means exhibit the example. But, in stating what I have to urge, in favour of continuing in the established church, against *their*

[1] The communication to which the writer refers was made in the year 1813.

objections, I cannot well avoid giving my sentiments on far larger, and more ancient, and highly respectable bodies of men; among whom, in former times, many of the most "burning and "shining lights" of the Christian church were found, and indeed some are at this day.

I am far from a disposition to join the modern outcry against the puritans—the progenitors of many of our present dissenters. Had my lot been cast in those *persecuting* days, I can only doubt whether I should have been found among them or not, by questioning whether I should have had sufficient courage of faith and hope to join the persecuted party. Many, no doubt, who obtained an undue ascendency among them, in the turbulent days of Charles the first, and even before that time, were factious ambitious hypocrites: but I must think, that the tree of liberty, sober and legitimate liberty, civil and religious, under the shadow of which we, in the establishment as well as others, repose in peace, and the fruit of which we gather, was planted by the puritans, and watered, if not by their blood, at least by their tears. Yet, it is the modern fashion to feed delightfully on the fruit, and then to revile, if not curse, those who planted and watered the tree!

I do not indeed think that any, in our favoured days, have so strong reasons for dissenting as the puritans had, even in the preceding times; much less, as *they* had who were ejected on the restoration of Charles the second. I am not disposed to vindicate, much less to panegyrize the whole body, or all their measures: but surely the guilt of the *schism*, whatever it was, did not *wholly*, or

principally, belong to them.—This division has continued till our time. I have no wish to charge all the blame of it on one party; or to plead the divine right of the established church, or of episcopacy; or to be severe upon dissenters; or on men who join them, especially where no adequate means of instruction can be obtained elsewhere. I should act *unfairly*, if, in what I urge for the lawfulness and expediency of continuing in the established church, by those Christians or ministers who now belong to it, I should, even by silence, leave it to be concluded that *such* were my views. I respect and love many dissenters, both ministers and people; I do not wish to proselyte them; but yet I think, *cæteris paribus*, Christians and ministers belonging to the establishment will do well to continue in it; and that in our days they have no sufficient reason for leaving it; at least when edifying means of grace, and fair opportunities of exercising the ministry are afforded them under its banner.

This premised, to prevent misconstruction, I proceed more particularly to your question—'Is 'the church of England *unscriptural?*' From the connexion in which the question is placed, I supposed it to be asked by a disciple of the Haldanes. I am grieved that these innovators have found access to your people: not because I think their arguments formidable; but because they address the *self-sufficiency* of some, who are excited to set up for judges of things which they do not understand; and the *scrupulous conscientiousness* of others, who are so afraid of being

wrong, that they can never be satisfied they are *right*; and are thus liable "to be tossed to and "fro by every wind of doctrine." But, when persons of any description ask this question, do they mean to insinuate, that the church of England is *altogether unscriptural?* or only that some things in that church are *unscriptural?* for these are widely different questions. And do they distinguish between what is *unscriptural*, and what is *antiscriptural?* For instance it may be *unscriptural* to wear a surplice; for that is not prescribed in scripture: but it is *antiscriptural* to worship images, or the host.

They will hardly say, that the church of England is *antiscriptural*, or *wholly unscriptural*, in doctrine, as well as worship and external administration. And can they find any company of professed Christians, among whom there is *nothing unscriptural?* I own I have looked far around, and read many books, and thought very deeply on the subject, for a long course of years; but I have not yet met with such a company; or heard of such a company, except from the zealots belonging to it. These, in all churches, popish and protestant, episcopal, presbyterian, independent, or what not, see every thing right among themselves, and every thing wrong in those who differ from them: but, if I loved controversy, and were somewhat younger, I should feel a confidence that I could go through them all, one by one, and undeniably prove that there are some things *right* in all, and some things *wrong* in all; at least, if that is *wrong* which has no express warrant in scripture. Every impartial and diligent student of these subjects

must allow, that the eager disputants on all sides are like the heathen philosophers of different schools, *Gladium habent scutum non habent*; and are therefore more successful in assailing their opponents, than in defending themselves. What then is to be done? Must we renounce Christianity? or decline all public worship, and the exercise of the ministry, till these disputes be settled? Or, must we form each a new sect, perfectly *scriptural*, at least in our own judgment or fancy? To say nothing of the immense mischief, beyond all calculation, of thus multiplying sects and rending the church; where is that man, possessed of even the least degree of humility, who will dare to think that his new modelled church is not in some points assailable; as all others hitherto have been? The very presumption that this is the case is *antichristian:* it is *papal infallibility*, which resides in many other places besides with the Pope at Rome, or in the church of Rome.

Ought we then to continue in communion with a church in which we perceive *some things to be unscriptural?* To this I would answer; if some things are unscriptural in each church or sect, nothing but heedlessness or prejudice can prevent our perceiving them: and a man of enlarged mind, of impartiality, and competent knowledge, cannot be supposed to be ignorant of them. He then has no alternative; but either to continue where *some things are unscriptural*, or to join another company in which he perceives the case to be the same.—But let it be remembered that things *unscriptural* are not always, nor generally, *antiscriptural.* When

indeed even indifferent things are *imposed* on the mass of inhabitants in any country, and enforced by pénal statutes; and when they are considered as paramount[1] to God's commandments, they become *antiscriptural*. "Full well ye reject the "commandments of God, that ye may keep your "own traditions." But, when considered merely as *circumstances*; when required of none but those who *voluntarily* belong to that part of the church, while others have unrestricted toleration; and while kept in entire subordination to the commands and doctrines of scripture; they may be *unscriptural* and yet not *antiscriptural*. This will appear as we proceed.

What then ought the question to be? It may be put in this manner: Ought we to continue in a church, or among a company of worshippers, where we *individually* are required to do what we judge *antiscriptural*; or where things indifferent are imposed in an antiscriptural manner?

Even the regulations adopted in Mr. Haldane's societies, which are not expressly contained in the words of scripture, are as really *unscriptural* as the forms and ceremonies of our church; and are imposed, or required, in the very same manner; namely, You must comply with them, if you choose to belong to our company; but you are at liberty to go elsewhere.

We ought by no means to join in worship, which after careful examination, made with modesty and fervent prayer, and with deference to the judgment of wise and good men, we are con-

[1] Qu. *Equivalent*.—J. S.

vinced requires of us things *antiscriptural*. On this ground, I must separate from the church of Rome; and I own, on this ground I should think it right to separate from any church, which imposed even *unscriptural* observances, or *any* observances, by the *antiscriptural* weapon of persecution. But I cannot for a moment, concede, that in present circumstances the same reason exists for leaving the church of England.

There seems to be no difficulty as to *private* worshippers, and what is individually required of them: unless *a* liturgy, or *our* liturgy, be antiscriptural.—In the subscriptions, and engagements required of ministers, at ordination, and institution, and on other occasions, there may be some particulars rather more difficult to conscientious or scrupulous persons: yet nothing, so far as I can see, which can render it needful to leave the church, unless we could find a company in which all things were *perfectly* right. Much is often spoken with great confidence, as if acknowledged and undoubted facts were referred to, concerning the *oaths* required of us: but, except subscriptions as in the presence of God, and 'assent and consent,' be considered as *oaths*, (I would they were more generally regarded as such;) no oath is, I think, required at any time, to which a peaceable subject and a steady protestant can well object; and I would challenge those who persevere in asserting the contrary, to prove the assertion by any quotation from our authorized books, or any other authentic document.

In some of the higher stations of the church indeed, and in matters in which private Christians

and ordinary ministers are not required to take any share, there are regulations and customs more liable to objection; which, as I would not justify, so I do not think it needful at present to particularize. For, as we are not called to concur in them, or by any direct act to sanction them; they do not seem to involve us in the decision which may be made concerning them.

In the days of John the Baptist, many grievous deviations from the Mosaic law had been introduced; and especially the high priesthood, and its dependent dignities and emoluments, were disposed of in the most rapacious, ambitious, and worldly manner imaginable: yet, while John protested against all prevailing iniquities, with the boldness of Elijah; he neither deemed it unlawful for himself to continue in communion with the Jewish church, even as then administered, nor did he exhort others to renounce it. Our Lord himself, also, while he protested against the corruptions which prevailed, and the traditions of the elders; yet continued to adhere to the worship at the temple, and even at the synagogue; and taught his disciples to do the same. Nor is there the least intimation, that they, or other pious worshippers, were answerable for the crimes of the scribes and priests, which they could not prevent, in which they did not concur, and over which they lamented.

It may be said, that the Mosaic law was of divine appointment and authority so long as it was intended to exist; and it must therefore be complied with: but the church of England is not of divine authority. To this it may be answered, that

Christian worship and ordinances, and the work of the Christian ministry, are of divine authority: that it is not possible to join any body of Christians, as to these things, in which some of us at least would not be required either to do, or to witness and bear with, what we decidedly disapproved: that the parallel is not supposed to hold further, than to shew that we are not *answerable* for the crimes or faults of that whole company to which we belong, provided we be not required to join in them, or by any direct means to sanction them: and that, while this does not prove that we are *bound* to continue in the church of England, it shews that we may lawfully do so, especially till we know where to mend ourselves: unless indeed the church of England be Babylon, and we cannot continue in her without "partaking" of Babylon's crimes and punishment; which I cannot possibly think to be the case. For it is *impossible* to worship or exercise the ministry in the church of Rome, without partaking of her idolatries; but, whatever real or supposed faults there may be in some things connected with our establishment, we may continue to worship and to exercise our ministry within it, and not at all partake of them: for they relate chiefly to the ecclesiastical courts, and the patronage of rich preferments, and other things connected with a sphere of life, from which a man, if he please, at least, may keep at a distance.

If it had pleased God that the Christian church should be, in all countries and ages, uniform in its government, discipline, and external administration; we should have had some thing in the New Testament analogous to the book of Leviticus in

the old: but it is plain, even from the different opinions contended for on these points, that it is not so. For, as it appears to me, the Lord saw good to leave matters of this kind with only general regulations, to be accommodated to circumstances, in different parts of the church; and under different providential dispensations, as countenanced or opposed by the existing powers.

When I published 'The Force of Truth,' (1779,) I was far from *partial* to the church of England: but I judged that, as the Lord had met and called me there, I ought to continue in my station, till I had determined, after due deliberation and prayer, whether I ought to remove, and what body of Christians to join: for I have always considered it as a sound maxim, that a man has a good reason for continuing in his present place, except he has a stronger reason for leaving it. I therefore set about inquiring after the most scriptural church, in the same manner as I had before searched for scriptural truth.—In this inquiry, I was retarded a while by the baptists, or antipedobaptists, with many of whom I was acquainted. A few months, however, led me to a satisfactory conclusion, that infant baptism is scriptural, though often attended by unscriptural appendages: and that *pouring* water is as much baptism, if duly performed "in "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and "of the Holy Ghost," as immersion in water. *Sprinkling*, though continually spoken of, on both sides in the controversy, is not the term used in our offices.

Connected with this, and after this was for the

present decided, I considered the plan of the Independents respecting church government: but I could not be satisfied that their manner of choosing and treating their pastors was scriptural. I could indeed find scriptural authority, for the people choosing their *deacons*, or stewards of temporal property; but none for choosing those who were to "watch for their souls, as they that must give "account." It seemed to me to place the minister in too dependent a situation on the very persons to whom he was required "to declare the whole "counsel of God;" and, in case of a departure from the truth, in a great degree to exclude or counteract a revival. For heretical and worldly churches, if wholly and *independently* left to their own choice, will choose "pastors after their own heart." I was also aware that in these, as well as in other elections, the rich must have undue influence; and they are not always the most spiritual part of a worshipping company: and I had various opportunities of witnessing the divisions which arose from these and similar circumstances. I must, however, acknowledge that the simplicity and piety, the firmness and talent, of many ministers in this part of the universal church; concurring with the prudent and conscientious behaviour of those in their congregations; in various instances prevent greatly these effects: and, on the other hand, I must allow that the people ought at least to have a negative, in respect of a pastor being placed over them; provided they can shew any thing in his doctrine, or in his moral and religious character, unsuited to the relation about to be formed. Still, however, the situation of a minister in an inde-

pendent congregation appeared to me what I could not *conscientiously* occupy.

I had not equal opportunities of examining the presbyterian plan: but I could readily discover that many of their arrangements are destitute of foundation in scripture; and that the machine is too cumbrous and complicated for use. On these accounts I was by no means disposed to join that company.—Other sects, or companies, have since that time passed under my review; and the result has been, that I am become more and more satisfied with my situation in the establishment. I am decidedly of opinion that it gives a faithful and conscientious minister more advantages for usefulness, at least as the pastor of a congregation, than can be found elsewhere: and that the people, who are placed under such a minister, have more advantages for edification in humble love, than are generally found in other companies; though not so much opportunity of gratifying the *natural* love of being considered *as of some consequence*, which does not die even in true converts.

In respect of discipline we are acknowledged to be defective:[1] yet I know by experience, that a conscientious minister, if he will use his influence with humble firmness and impartiality may exclude improper persons from the Lord's table, far beyond what is generally supposed; not by authority indeed, but by firm admonition. Yet, in baptizing the children of all nominal Christians, and in considering all persons who are not excommunicated, or

[1] See the Service for Ash Wednesday.

joined to the dissenters, as members of the church; the ground is laid for most of our other difficulties. I have, however, so rarely seen the power of *the church*, or *the communicants*, among the dissenters, impartially exercised, especially in respect of the affluent, that I am rather the better satisfied with things as they are. Yet, it is highly desirable that a steady discipline should be introduced in the establishment, chiefly under the inspection of the parish ministers, but with appeal in doubtful or difficult cases to the diocesan.

Aiming at too much in this respect, commonly defeats the end; as it excites prejudice and opposition, gives the whole an air of sternness and spiritual pride, and makes way for attempts to shelter the offending person. Thus the penal attendants on excommunication have rendered it terrible and hateful in the eyes of men in general. Even simple exclusion from the Lord's supper, however mildly done, should be enforced on those only who are *evidently* improper persons: for no discipline can exclude plausible hypocrites. The very idea, of man's being capable of exactly distinguishing believers from unbelievers, is a presumptuous intrusion into his province, who "alone "trieth the hearts of the children of men:" while it extremely exposes those who act upon it to the danger of "rooting up the wheat *with* the "tares," or perhaps *instead* of the tares.

As far as I can recollect, Mr. Haldane's plan (for I have not his book at hand,) aims to exclude *unbelievers*, not only from the Lord's table, but also from public and social worship; which is altogether, not merely *unscriptural*, but *antiscrip-*

tural, as it prevents their attendance on those means of grace, by which God works conversion.[1] 'I had understood that Mr. W. refused to admit 'any but the church in time of prayer and praise: 'but this does not appear to be accurate. I have 'heard that the church and spectators are in dif- 'ferent rooms, or have a visible mode of separa- 'tion. If so, I believe it is far from the spirit of 'the gospel.—The spirit of the gospel resembles 'the principle of *attraction* in the natural world; 'but this spirit is like the principle of *repulsion,* 'which would crumble the whole church into dis- 'cordant atoms.'[2] Surely, it also coincides with the language of those in ancient times, who said, "Stand by thyself, come not near to me, I am "holier than thou."[3] "God, I thank thee that I "am not like the rest of men, (οἱ λοιποὶ,) or even "as this publican."[4]—'The reasoning from 'prayer and praise, to the Lord's supper, is, I 'think, sophistical. These are moral duties, 'binding on all. Whether they join in them or 'not, they ought so to do. But baptism and the 'Lord's supper are positive institutes, and which 'are not the immediate duty of unbelievers.'[5] Yet, in respect of these positive institutions, it is surely presumptuous to suppose, that we can certainly know true believers from others: for the Lord alone can search the heart.—'When engaged 'in prayer and praise, and using plural pronouns, 'as when I say We desire, &c.; I consider myself 'as joining with as many as do join in it; and that

[1] Cor. xiv. 23—25.
[2] Rev. A. Fuller.
[3] Is. lxv. 5.
[4] Luke xviii. 11.
[5] Rev. A. Fuller.

'all others are mere spectators.'[1] May not a minister of the establishment do the same, in respect of the admirable petitions and thanksgivings of the liturgy? And is not this enough for his complete satisfaction?

Whether it be in the public worship, or at the Lord's table, the presence of either openly wicked persons or hypocrites will not prevent the acceptableness of our services; if their presence be not the effect of our sin. We should chiefly look to ourselves: if duly humbled, we shall not be disposed to reflect on others as worse than ourselves: and surely, it too much resembles the Pharisee, to be eying the Publican with disdain, saying "Stand "by thyself, I am holier than thou," when we ought to be pouring out our souls in humble prayer to God! or, indeed, in any way to think of the poor publican, except to lift a prayer to God in his behalf also.

In respect of liturgies: if all ministers were eminent in grace and gifts, perhaps they might be dispensed with. Yet they were of early use in the church: and I cannot but think, in modern times, that our liturgy, when reverently and distinctly read, forms the most spiritual and scriptural public worship on which I ever attended; and I have been, as I trust, a candid observer, nay a worshipper, in many places where it is not used. Except on special occasions, the general wants of a public congregation will continue the same from week to week, and the general topics of adoration,

[1] Rev. A. Fuller.

intercession, and thanksgiving: so that we do not so much require new words as new affections of the heart, excited, not by new words, but by "the "Spirit of grace and of supplications;" in order to "worship in spirit and truth." Even they who use no liturgy have either some plan formed in their own mind, if not proposed to them; or their worship becomes confused and partial, perhaps not unsuitable to a private circle, but defective at least as public worship. They who attend where a liturgy is not used, if strictly observant and impartial, cannot but acknowledge that the same ground is gone over by the officiating minister, almost as regularly as with a liturgy. And indeed it ought to be so; except as to occasional variations, and in cases of peculiar emergency: and then able, wise, and pious men may be allowed to have some advantages. But our liturgy contains every general subject of worship, in most simple and suitable words, in the genuine language of devotion: in most parts, especially in our beautiful litany, it comprises, with perspicuous brevity, *multum in parvo;* and I must declare, that I seem to enter into the spirit of it with far greater satisfaction and delight in my old age, than I did in my younger years. Indeed, no authoritative injunction prohibits us, from using, in few words, petitions, supplications, or praises, as special circumstances require, in the pulpit, before and after sermon. I say, *in few words;* for any thing beyond this does not suit the general nature of our worship, and makes way for unedifying repetition.

The reading of the holy scriptures also in our worship, if properly performed, is an honour due

to the word of God, and tends exceedingly to interest and edify the congregation; and to prepare it for the faithful preaching of the gospel.

But the most difficult part of the subject yet remains; I mean what relates to establishments, which many condemn as wholly *unscriptural*, if not *antiscriptural:* and which, I must impartially own, are often defended, and even extolled, in an unscriptural manner.

If no way of defending our establishment can be devised, which would not, if fairly applied defend the establishment of popery, of Mohammedism, or pagan idolatry, by the authority of kings and rulers; I must acknowledge the cause to be desperate. Yet if it be a *right* of kings and rulers to prescribe the creed and manner of worship, with its appendages, to their subjects, and to enforce their concurrence; it must be equally the right of all kings; for they all think, or profess to think, their own religion to be the true religion.—Again, if it be the *duty* of kings and rulers, to prescribe these things to their subjects, it is equally the duty of all kings, and for the same reason. This is the *palladium* of those who oppose establishments: and how shall we deprive them of it? Surely not by pleading the excellency of our own establishment, as if in all respects faultless, and as such entitled to be considered as distinct from that of other nations: for this will not be admitted by any party, ourselves excepted; or, rather, some among ourselves.

Let us then try if another view cannot be taken of the subject. "Improvement of talent" is ex-

sential to the Christian system: "faith working "by love," and love thus proved sincere. Genius, learning, wealth, authority, and influence, are talents, of which good or bad use may be made; or they may be buried in the earth. Time itself, the gift of speech, ready utterance, and eloquence, are talents of the same nature. A man possessed of a thousand, or ten thousand pounds per annum may, by the allowance of all, improve his talent to good purpose; provided he employ it in a scriptural manner. But if he claim the *right*, or consider himself bound in *duty*, by all that which money can do, to bring others over to profess his creed, or conform to his mode of worship; because he thinks the one true and the other right; he may probably please bigots of his own party, and make hypocrites, but he will not promote the genuine interests of pure Christianity.

Is not the case the same with power and authority? Where are the boundaries to be fixed, between those who *ought* to improve, and those who *must not* improve their talent? In fact, all the servants of Christ are bound by the strongest obligations to shew the "sincerity of their love" by improving their talents: not by using either wealth or power to *enforce* or *hire* compliance with their own views of Christianity; but, by employing it to provide as far as they can, by all scriptural means, for the religious instruction of mankind at large, of their neighbours or subjects especially, and the education of the rising generation. And in these things kings and rulers should proceed (only on a larger scale,) nearly by the same means which an affluent, zealous, and

well-informed Christian, in his own line, would do.

Now, whether an establishment of some kind might not be the best method, in which a king or ruler could improve his talent, may be a question: but the negative of it cannot be considered as self-evident; though it seems taken for granted that it is so by many who reason against all establishments.

The religion of Israel was an establishment, not indeed of human but of divine appointment: yet this clearly shews that the thing is not evil in itself, but may, in certain cases, be made conducive to the general good of a nation or people. The kings of Israel, who revolted from the family of David, framed establishments according to their own heart, but in opposition to the word of God: and Nebuchadnezzar and many other idolatrous monarchs established their false religion, by carnal weapons. The ends proposed, and the means employed, were alike impious and iniquitous. But that was the fault, not of the thing itself, but of their peculiar establishments.

Under the establishment which God himself instituted, and in supporting which he employed not only priests and prophets, but kings also; idolatry, indeed, was punishable with death, as high treason against the king of Israel: but it does not appear that persecution, in any other respect, was required or allowed. Had Jehoshaphat, or Hezekiah, or Josiah modelled the religion of Judah according to his own views; or, having added his own traditions or injunctions, or those of the elders, to the law of God, either imposed

the whole by pains and penalties, or allured the selfish and ambitious to conform by proposing to them emoluments and honours; he would have deviated from the line of duty, and his establishment would have been an evil thing. I mention not David in this connexion, because he was also a prophet, and made many arrangements by authority derived immediately from God.

But it is evident that God approved, and blessed, the exercise of authority in subserviency to the law of Moses, in a variety of ways, which seem excluded by the arguments often used against establishments of every kind. Jehoshaphat went so far, that he devised and executed a measure no where required in the law. "In the third year of "his reign, he sent to his princes to teach in the "cities of Judah: and with them he sent Levites; "and with them priests. And they taught in "Judah and had the book of the law of the Lord "with them, and went about throughout all the "cities of Judah, and taught the people."[1] Hezekiah excited, and admonished, and even in some respects instructed, the Levites and the priests to be earnest and diligent, according to the duties of their places.[2] "He took counsel also with his "*princes*, and all the congregation, to keep the "passover in the second month:" he sent to invite the Israelites to join with them in this sacred service: he prayed for them, and encouraged them, and blessed them: he provided for their paschal offerings and oblations. "Also in Judah "the hand of God was to give them one heart, to

[1] 2 Chr. xvii. 7—11. [2] 2 Chr. xxix. 3—10, 21, 24, 27, 30, 31.

"do the commandment of the king and of his "princes, according to the word of God."[1] What shall we say to this? Would it be unlawful in a Christian king to imitate this example?—Hezekiah also took care that the people should bring their tithes; that the priests and Levites should have their dues; and that they should attend to their several duties: and at the close of this account it is added, "Thus did Hezekiah, throughout all "Judah, and wrought that which was good, and "right, and truth, before the Lord his God. "And in every work that he began in the service "of the house of God, and in the law, and in the "commandments, to seek his God, he did it with "all his heart, and prospered."[2]

Josiah seems to have begun his reformation, without having more than a traditional acquaintance with the divine law; or such as was gathered from extracts or compendiums: but, when "the "book of the law was brought and read to him," he conducted the whole according to its express directions.

It does not appear that any of the pious reforming kings of Judah used measures which are uncongenial with the spirit of Christianity. They attempted nothing by persecution: and even the sentence of the law against idolaters was very sparingly executed. Their authority was exercised in mildness: by fair statements, and convincing arguments, accompanied with exhortations, admonitions, and expostulations, they procured the concurrence of princes and people:

[1] 2 Chr. xxx. 12. [2] 2 Chr. xxxi. 20, 21.

and thus they excited the priests and Levites to do their duty; and in some cases shamed them out of their negligence. Their appeal was uniformly "to the law and to the testimony;" and it was their plan to reduce the religion of Judah to the scriptural standard. In doing this, some ventured and succeeded further than others; and were accordingly approved or blamed by the prophets whom God raised up among them. But Ahaz and Uzziah exercised their kingly authority in an *anti-scriptural* manner, and were rebuked accordingly.

Even a heathen king was led to exercise his authority in promoting true religion, after an unexceptionable manner. Artaxerxes, having made most liberal grants and donations to Ezra, for the service of the temple and worship at Jerusalem; adds, "Whatsoever is commanded by the "God of heaven, let it be done diligently." "And "thou, Ezra, after the wisdom of God that is in "thine hand, set magistrates and judges, who may "judge all the people that are beyond the river; "all such as know the laws of God; and teach "ye them that know them not." [1] He did not attempt to model the religion of Israel according to his own views; but he left that to the ministers of that religion, and especially to Ezra: but he protected and countenanced the zealous servants of God; and, because of the impoverished state of the Jews, he supplied them with the necessary expenses for conducting the worship at the temple. And, though he closed with authorizing Ezra to punish delinquents, even those who "would not do

[1] Ezra vii. 11—26.

" the law of his God, and the law of the king;" yet Ezra said, " Blessed be the Lord God of our " Fathers, who hath put such a thing into the heart " of the king, to beautify the house of the Lord, " which is at Jerusalem."

It is pleaded against establishments in general, that there was none in the primitive church during the three first centuries: and this indeed proves that Christianity can subsist and flourish without an establishment, and even that it can subsist and flourish under persecution: but this does not imply, that such a state of things is *necessary* to the subsistence and flourishing of the church. In like manner there was no temple for above 400 years after Israel entered Canaan; yet at length Solomon was chosen to build one. There could be no establishment as long as there were no Christian kings or rulers: as none of Christ's servants were intrusted with authority, none could improve it as a talent. The first establishment under Constantine and his successors was in various ways very faulty: yet the triumphs of Christianity over idolatry throughout the Roman empire, by means of it, were, if I mistake not, deemed worthy of a place in prophecy, as marking an era in which Satan suffered a very signal defeat: though, alas! it was not of very long duration; for an idolatrous, antichristian, persecuting empire was in a short time substituted in the stead of the pagan empire.

Christianity is not so poor or feeble, as to be dependent for existence or success either on the wealthy or the potent: nay, she could maintain her ground, and make new victories, when all the rich

and the mighty opposed her: but neither does she haughtily disdain the assistance and countenance of either the one or the other, if afforded without interference in those things which are peculiar to her true prosperity and glory. Yet many, who readily accept the assistance of the *wealthy*, and glory in the concurrence of the ingenious, and learned, and noble, in accomplishing plans of Christian benevolence, seem decided against receiving the most unexceptionable aid from the *powerful* of the earth.

If it was, as I suppose, the design of Providence, to leave Christianity so unencumbered, that it might be capable of accommodating itself to outward circumstances, whatever they might be, in every land in which it was propagated: it cannot be expected that an establishment, arranged under a variety of particulars, as under the Mosaic dispensation, should be found in the New Testament; but are we thence to conclude that Christian kings ought not to do any thing to promote the religion of Christ among the inhabitants of the countries which they govern? Must they alone, of all men, "care for none of these things," and merely confine themselves to temporal matters?

But we read in prophecy, that "kings shall "be nursing fathers, and their queens nursing "mothers" to the church.[1] Now, in what manner shall this prophecy, and others to a similar effect, be accomplished, if Gallio be indeed, as [illegible] pear to think he was, the model even [illegible] magistrate? Should it please [illegible]

[1] Is. xlix. [illegible]

kings, like Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah; who should, according to the genius of the new dispensation, imitate their example, as it has been above stated, the way in which the prophecies would be fulfilled must then be plain to every one. But I will not absolutely decide, whether what is now called an *establishment* would be one part of their plan, or not: perhaps nothing could give them so great advantage, in providing instruction and the means of grace for the population of any country, and a Christian education for the lower orders in the community, as something of this nature would do. Nor can I think it altogether impracticable, for the broad ground of the New Testament to be proceeded on, in nearly the same manner as pious kings of Judah proceeded upon the broad ground of the Old Testament: nothing required, as a term of communion, but what wise and pious men in general allowed to be scriptural; things indifferent left so; and much latitude allowed in respect of expressions, forms, postures, and all such things, as evidently conscientious pious persons may be supposed to view differently.

In countries professing Christianity, the places appropriated for public worship, and the funds devoted to the cause of religion, might, in such a case, come greatly in aid of the design of thus giving to all parts of a nation 'the means of grace.' Those funds are incumbrances under which estates have been bought, sold, and inherited for ages, as a kind of public property; and, if not [illegible], will be seized on for secu- over given to those who pos- they inherited or purchased

as liable to this deduction. Nor, indeed, ought they to be so given; for the tithes and other similar imposts on estates, having existed from time immemorial, no more belong to the owner of the estate, than the rent belongs to the farmer, instead of the landlord. If the plan in countries now professing Christianity, or in countries hereafter to be evangelized, require other funds; these, if raised by *general taxation* of any kind, ought, no doubt, to be impartially administered. And, even if the establishment should be rendered as comprehensive as can well be conceived, some may be supposed to dissent from it: and, I own it as my opinion, not only that all such persons as act peaceably in dissenting should have full toleration; but also that, with some limitations perhaps, (as idolatry in worship, or *grossly* immoral principles, or heresy subversive of the great mystery "of godliness," or principles subversive of civil government,) the funds raised by general taxation, at least, should be applied to support in part the quietly dissenting, as well as the established worship.

These are indeed *Utopian* thoughts of a possibly existing establishment: and I only adduce them to shew that establishments are not antiscriptural in themselves; and that we may lawfully worship, and officiate as ministers, in an establishment; provided that establishment does not require of us things in other respects contrary to our consciences.

Whatever we determine of the right and duty of kings in this respect: popish, Mohammedan, and pagan kings will *establish* their several reli-

gions, as far as policy or bigotry dictate; notwithstanding our speculations. But shall we, on that account, use all our influence with a Hezekiah, or a Josiah, that we may induce him to "bury his "talent in the earth?" Or shall we, with the prophets of old, encourage him to go on and prosper; only keeping close to the oracles of God, as the rule and standard of all his measures?

I therefore am of opinion that, in the approaching happy days, something like establishments will take place: but how far they may accord to, or differ from, our establishment, I would not presume to determine. In the mean time, I would be thankful for our present advantages, and counsel my younger brethren not to be induced on slight grounds to forego them, but to endeavour to improve them to the utmost of their ability.

I remain, dear Sir,

Yours, &c.

THOMAS SCOTT.

LETTER II.

Aston Sandford, Nov. 23, 1815.

DEAR SIR,

BEFORE I received your note, I had thought of writing to you, with a view to a second edition of your pamphlet, a few additional remarks on establishments in general, and on the advantages of our establishment; which are not, as it appears to me and to some others, sufficiently valued, or their value sufficiently appreciated in the general argument. I would, however, introduce them with a few previous remarks.

They who oppose all establishments aver, that they plead for *primitive Christianity:* but this assumes, as if indisputable, the very point about which the controversy is maintained. None, I hope, who love our holy religion, mean to deviate from primitive Christianity; we only would have it stated in what this consists, with conclusive proofs to establish the point.

Even in respect of the external form and government of the primitive church, to this hour *sub judice lis est,* whether it were episcopal, presbyterian, or independent; or something different from all of them, and combining some parts of

each system. And, as we have long been in full possession of all the evidence which we are ever likely to have, it is clear that something beyond outward evidence is needful to produce coincidence of opinion, amidst the contenders for different systems; even, "the pouring out of the "Spirit" of truth and love upon us all. One thing indeed is certain, that in the primitive Church there was no establishment: for as there was no emperor or king so much as calling himself Christian, even an establishment like that of Jeroboam was impracticable.

There are some who, in vindicating their attempts to draw off pious and conscientious ministers from the establishment, plead that they 'have 'to do only with those of whom the *establishment* 'is ashamed, and of whom it labours to get rid.' Yet they at the same time own, that these are the very persons whose preaching and labours most accord to the liturgy and articles of the church? Now what do they dignify in this argument as the *establishment*, but that party of its rulers and ministers, or members, whom they consider as most opposed in doctrine and living to the authorized writings of the church of England? Whether they be so or not, they are so by this concession or statement. But, however the fact may be in this respect, were all the archbishops, bishops, and clergy unanimous, they are not the establishment: even if they were all sound in doctrine and holy in life, and exemplary in labour, they would not be the establishment; but merely the officers and *administrators* of the establishment. Even the king, lords spiritual and temporal, and com-

mons, assembled in parliament; though possessed of authority, to make alterations which all the bishops and clergy combined have not; are nevertheless not the establishment: any more than they are the British constitution, or *Magna Charta*.—The books of the church of England, as authorized by act of parliament, and administered by the executive power, so to speak, are the establishment. So long as these are for us, the establishment is for us, how many soever of the officers or administrators are against us: and, were all the rest of the whole company against half a dozen ministers, as decidedly and unanimously as Caiaphas and the chief priests and rulers were against Christ and his apostles; the establishment would be no more against that half dozen, provided these books were for them, than the Mosaic establishment was against Christ and his apostles. Nay, should the parliament interfere materially to alter these books, and make them to be against that half dozen, it would, in fact, make a new establishment, quite different from that under which they entered and continued as members or ministers in the church of England; and they would then be warranted and required to withdraw from it: so far are things from being left to the mere arbitrary will of any rulers of the church, as many seem to think, or are willing to state, that they are.—It does not appear, however, that there is at present any disposition in our parliament to alter the establishment; and it is far from the truth, that its administrators are all ashamed of us, and desirous to get rid of us. But on the supposition that the party, of which some are ashamed and

wish to get rid, do live, labour, and preach according to the liturgy, articles, and homilies of the church; to draw them off from it would be the ruin of the establishment, beyond all else that could possibly be done: and *Ichabod* might be written on the remaining *caput mortuum*.

In the argument concerning the people's choosing their own ministers: in support of this practice some disputants introduce the word χειροτονέω, as if decidedly in favour of it. Now, in fact, the word occurs only twice in all the New Testament. In the first instance,[1] χειροτονήσαντες, as well as the other participles in the context, refers, exclusively and undeniably, to what Paul and Barnabas did for the churches; and not to what the churches did for themselves. In the second instance,[2] χειροτονηθεὶς refers to the brother, whom the churches had chosen to take charge of their money, not of their souls: and it is most certain that men may be far more safely trusted in the former case than the latter. The word also occurs in composition:[3] Προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, "chosen before of God." The scriptural use therefore of this word gives not the smallest countenance to the opinion of the people's electing their spiritual pastors; and I aver, that no proof of it can be adduced from the New Testament: for be it again noticed, that the deacons were chosen to take care of the *pecuniary concerns*, not of the *souls* of those who elected them; and no instance of such an election has hitherto been produced in the latter case: nay, the supposition

[1] Acts xiv. 23. [2] 2 Cor. viii. 19. [3] Acts x. 41.

and thus they excited the priests and Levites to do their duty; and in some cases shamed them out of their negligence. Their appeal was uniformly "to the law and to the testimony;" and it was their plan to reduce the religion of Judah to the scriptural standard. In doing this, some ventured and succeeded further than others; and were accordingly approved or blamed by the prophets whom God raised up among them. But Ahaz and Uzziah exercised their kingly authority in an *anti-scriptural* manner, and were rebuked accordingly.

Even a heathen king was led to exercise his authority in promoting true religion, after an unexceptionable manner. Artaxerxes, having made most liberal grants and donations to Ezra, for the service of the temple and worship at Jerusalem; adds, "Whatsoever is commanded by the "God of heaven, let it be done diligently." "And "thou, Ezra, after the wisdom of God that is in "thine hand, set magistrates and judges, who may "judge all the people that are beyond the river; "all such as know the laws of God; and teach "ye them that know them not." [1] He did not attempt to model the religion of Israel according to his own views; but he left that to the ministers of that religion, and especially to Ezra: but he protected and countenanced the zealous servants of God; and, because of the impoverished state of the Jews, he supplied them with the necessary expenses for conducting the worship at the temple. And, though he closed with authorizing Ezra to punish delinquents, even those who "would not do

[1] Ezra vii. 11—26.

"the law of his God, and the law of the king;" yet Ezra said, "Blessed be the Lord God of our "Fathers, who hath put such a thing into the heart "of the king, to beautify the house of the Lord, "which is at Jerusalem."

It is pleaded against establishments in general, that there was none in the primitive church during the three first centuries: and this indeed proves that Christianity can subsist and flourish without an establishment, and even that it can subsist and flourish under persecution: but this does not imply, that such a state of things is *necessary* to the subsistence and flourishing of the church. In like manner there was no temple for above 400 years after Israel entered Canaan; yet at length Solomon was chosen to build one. There could be no establishment as long as there were no Christian kings or rulers: as none of Christ's servants were intrusted with authority, none could improve it as a talent. The first establishment under Constantine and his successors was in various ways very faulty: yet the triumphs of Christianity over idolatry throughout the Roman empire, by means of it, were, if I mistake not, deemed worthy of a place in prophecy, as marking an era in which Satan suffered a very signal defeat: though, alas! it was not of very long duration; for an idolatrous, antichristian, persecuting empire was in a short time substituted in the stead of the pagan empire.

Christianity is not so poor or feeble, as to be dependent for existence or success either on the wealthy or the potent: nay, she could maintain her ground, and make new victories, when all the rich

and the mighty opposed her: but neither does she haughtily disdain the assistance and countenance of either the one or the other, if afforded without interference in those things which are peculiar to her true prosperity and glory. Yet many, who readily accept the assistance of the *wealthy*, and glory in the concurrence of the ingenious, and learned, and noble, in accomplishing plans of Christian benevolence, seem decided against receiving the most unexceptionable aid from the *powerful* of the earth.

If it was, as I suppose, the design of Providence, to leave Christianity so unencumbered, that it might be capable of accommodating itself to outward circumstances, whatever they might be, in every land in which it was propagated: it cannot be expected that an establishment, arranged under a variety of particulars, as under the Mosaic dispensation, should be found in the New Testament; but are we thence to conclude that Christian kings ought not to do any thing to promote the religion of Christ among the inhabitants of the countries which they govern? Must they alone, of all men, "care for none of these things," and merely confine themselves to temporal matters?

But we read in prophecy, that "kings shall "be nursing fathers, and their queens nursing "mothers" to the church.[1] Now, in what manner shall this prophecy, and others to a similar effect, be accomplished, if Gallio be indeed, as some appear to think he was, the model even of a Christian magistrate? Should it please God to raise up

[1] Is. xlix. 23.

kings, like Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah; who should, according to the genius of the new dispensation, imitate their example, as it has been above stated, the way in which the prophecies would be fulfilled must then be plain to every one. But I will not absolutely decide, whether what is now called an *establishment* would be one part of their plan, or not: perhaps nothing could give them so great advantage, in providing instruction and the means of grace for the population of any country, and a Christian education for the lower orders in the community, as something of this nature would do. Nor can I think it altogether impracticable, for the broad ground of the New Testament to be proceeded on, in nearly the same manner as pious kings of Judah proceeded upon the broad ground of the Old Testament: nothing required, as a term of communion, but what wise and pious men in general allowed to be scriptural; things indifferent left so; and much latitude allowed in respect of expressions, forms, postures, and all such things, as evidently conscientious pious persons may be supposed to view differently.

In countries professing Christianity, the places appropriated for public worship, and the funds devoted to the cause of religion, might, in such a case, come greatly in aid of the design of thus giving to all parts of a nation 'the means of grace.' Those funds are incumbrances under which estates have been bought, sold, and inherited for ages, and are a kind of public property; and, if not employed for religious, will be seized on for secular purposes, and never given to those who possess the estates, which they inherited or purchased

as liable to this deduction. Nor, indeed, ought they to be so given; for the tithes and other similar imposts on estates, having existed from time immemorial, no more belong to the owner of the estate, than the rent belongs to the farmer, instead of the landlord. If the plan in countries now professing Christianity, or in countries hereafter to be evangelized, require other funds; these, if raised by *general taxation* of any kind, ought, no doubt, to be impartially administered. And, even if the establishment should be rendered as comprehensive as can well be conceived, some may be supposed to dissent from it: and, I own it as my opinion, not only that all such persons as act peaceably in dissenting should have full toleration; but also that, with some limitations perhaps, (as idolatry in worship, or *grossly* immoral principles, or heresy subversive of the great mystery "of godliness," or principles subversive of civil government,) the funds raised by general taxation, at least, should be applied to support in part the quietly dissenting, as well as the established worship.

These are indeed *Utopian* thoughts of a possibly existing establishment: and I only adduce them to shew that establishments are not antiscriptural in themselves; and that we may lawfully worship, and officiate as ministers, in an establishment; provided that establishment does not require of us things in other respects contrary to our consciences.

Whatever we determine of the right and duty of kings in this respect: popish, Mohammedan, and pagan kings will *establish* their several reli-

gions, as far as policy or bigotry dictate; notwithstanding our speculations. But shall we, on that account, use all our influence with a Hezekiah, or a Josiah, that we may induce him to "bury his "talent in the earth?" Or shall we, with the prophets of old, encourage him to go on and prosper; only keeping close to the oracles of God, as the rule and standard of all his measures?

I therefore am of opinion that, in the approaching happy days, something like establishments will take place: but how far they may accord to, or differ from, our establishment, I would not presume to determine. In the mean time, I would be thankful for our present advantages, and counsel my younger brethren not to be induced on slight grounds to forego them, but to endeavour to improve them to the utmost of their ability.

I remain, dear Sir,

Yours, &c.

THOMAS SCOTT.

LETTER II.

Aston Sandford, Nov. 23, 1815.

DEAR SIR,

BEFORE I received your note, I had thought of writing to you, with a view to a second edition of your pamphlet, a few additional remarks on establishments in general, and on the advantages of our establishment; which are not, as it appears to me and to some others, sufficiently valued, or their value sufficiently appreciated in the general argument. I would, however, introduce them with a few previous remarks.

They who oppose all establishments aver, that they plead for *primitive Christianity:* but this assumes, as if indisputable, the very point about which the controversy is maintained. None, I hope, who love our holy religion, mean to deviate from primitive Christianity; we only would have it stated in what this consists, with conclusive proofs to establish the point.

Even in respect of the external form and government of the primitive church, to this hour *sub judice lis est,* whether it were episcopal, presbyterian, or independent; or something different from all of them, and combining some parts of

each system. And, as we have long been in full possession of all the evidence which we are ever likely to have, it is clear that something beyond outward evidence is needful to produce coincidence of opinion, amidst the contenders for different systems; even, "the pouring out of the "Spirit" of truth and love upon us all. One thing indeed is certain, that in the primitive Church there was no establishment: for as there was no emperor or king so much as calling himself Christian, even an establishment like that of Jeroboam was impracticable.

There are some who, in vindicating their attempts to draw off pious and conscientious ministers from the establishment, plead that they 'have 'to do only with those of whom the *establishment* 'is ashamed, and of whom it labours to get rid.' Yet they at the same time own, that these are the very persons whose preaching and labours most accord to the liturgy and articles of the church? Now what do they dignify in this argument as the *establishment*, but that party of its rulers and ministers, or members, whom they consider as most opposed in doctrine and living to the authorized writings of the church of England? Whether they be so or not, they are so by this concession or statement. But, however the fact may be in this respect, were all the archbishops, bishops, and clergy unanimous, they are not the establishment: even if they were all sound in doctrine and holy in life, and exemplary in labour, they would not be the establishment; but merely the officers and *administrators* of the establishment. Even the king, lords spiritual and temporal, and com-

mons, assembled in parliament; though possessed of authority, to make alterations which all the bishops and clergy combined have not; are nevertheless not the establishment: any more than they are the British constitution, or *Magna Charta*.—The books of the church of England, as authorized by act of parliament, and administered by the executive power, so to speak, are the establishment. So long as these are for us, the establishment is for us, how many soever of the officers or administrators are against us: and, were all the rest of the whole company against half a dozen ministers, as decidedly and unanimously as Caiaphas and the chief priests and rulers were against Christ and his apostles; the establishment would be no more against that half dozen, provided these books were for them, than the Mosaic establishment was against Christ and his apostles. Nay, should the parliament interfere materially to alter these books, and make them to be against that half dozen, it would, in fact, make a new establishment, quite different from that under which they entered and continued as members or ministers in the church of England; and they would then be warranted and required to withdraw from it: so far are things from being left to the mere arbitrary will of any rulers of the church, as many seem to think, or are willing to state, that they are.—It does not appear, however, that there is at present any disposition in our parliament to alter the establishment; and it is far from the truth, that its administrators are all ashamed of us, and desirous to get rid of us. But on the supposition that the party, of which some are ashamed and

wish to get rid, do live, labour, and preach according to the liturgy, articles, and homilies of the church; to draw them off from it would be the ruin of the establishment, beyond all else that could possibly be done: and *Ichabod* might be written on the remaining *caput mortuum*.

In the argument concerning the people's choosing their own ministers: in support of this practice some disputants introduce the word χειροτονέω, as if decidedly in favour of it. Now, in fact, the word occurs only twice in all the New Testament. In the first instance,[1] χειροτονήσαντες, as well as the other participles in the context, refers, exclusively and undeniably, to what Paul and Barnabas did for the churches; and not to what the churches did for themselves. In the second instance,[2] χειροτονηθεὶς refers to the brother, whom the churches had chosen to take charge of their money, not of their souls: and it is most certain that men may be far more safely trusted in the former case than the latter. The word also occurs in composition:[3] Προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, "chosen before of God." The scriptural use therefore of this word gives not the smallest countenance to the opinion of the people's electing their spiritual pastors; and I aver, that no proof of it can be adduced from the New Testament: for be it again noticed, that the deacons were chosen to take care of the *pecuniary concerns*, not of the *souls* of those who elected them; and no instance of such an election has hitherto been produced in the latter case: nay, the supposition

[1] Acts xiv. 23. [2] 2 Cor. viii. 19. [3] Acts x. 41.

of it cannot be made consistent with the language of the sacred writers.

It is stated that establishments do, and *must*, substitute *comprehension* instead of *selection*, and *secularity* instead of *spirituality*. Now, it does not appear to me that this is *fact*, even as to our establishment; much less that it is necessary to an establishment merely as such. *Toleration* is now a part of our establishment, and so essential a part, that it is on that ground alone that I could fully plead for continuance in it. *Toleration*, in its enlarged sense, is not consistent with that *comprehension* which many suppose essential to an establishment: nor can the intimations that a wholesome discipline is a thing much to be desired comport with it. It is not the wish of its best friends that all the population of the country should be of its communion, except on the supposition, either that they were already true Christians, or would be thus put into the best way of becoming such. I own I decidedly think the friends of full toleration the best friends of the church: and I cannot but entertain the opinion, that its best friends grieve exceedingly because such members are allowed, in some sense, to form a part of it, as ought not to belong to any Christian church, but to the visible kingdom of Satan. But, however that may be, an establishment may easily be conceived of, which has not in any degree this, if such it be, antiscriptural mark. Suppose a truly Christian prince, surrounded by a select number of pious counsellors, and able ministers of Christianity—as Isaiah was a counsellor of Hezekiah. Suppose that half of this king's

subjects continued idolaters, or even a much larger proportion. Suppose also that he should form an establishment, with the consent of his counsellors and senators, by which places of worship should be built at proper distances throughout his dominions, and a decent maintenance allotted to officiating ministers, left in many things to their own discretion, but with certain general rules and principles, to which their *voluntary* consent is required; and, on the supposition of episcopacy, some bishops, with rather larger allowance, to superintend the other pastors, to ordain, and under certain limitations to appoint to cures, &c. Suppose, again, schools annexed to these places of worship, and Christian schoolmasters decently maintained, to teach the elements of learning and the principles of Christianity to all the children in the vicinity, whom their parents should *voluntarily*, or influenced merely by argument and persuasion, send. Suppose all the population were invited and exhorted to attend the public service and instruction; but none compelled or hired. Suppose, also, that none were admitted as members of this established church, but such as had been baptized on a credible profession of Christianity; with those of their children who were too young to choose for themselves; all the rest remaining at the highest as catechumens. Suppose all those, and none else, who had been thus baptized, were admitted to the Lord's supper; and their children, when they, after proper instruction, themselves had made a credible profession of Christianity. Suppose that none but these persons were so considered as a part of the church, as to

have their infants baptized. Suppose all who evidently acted inconsistently with their profession, or renounced the faith, or its leading truths, were excluded by an easy process, and no other harm whatever attempted against them, but a continual watchfulness exercised over them to bring them to repentance, and restore them if penitent, with all temporal kindness, which did not imply approbation. Suppose that, some professed Christians still objecting to this arrangement, a full toleration should be granted them; and, under certain limitations, an allowance made to them for their places of worship, and maintenance of ministers. And, finally, suppose the rest of the community were ruled with equity and lenity, and no advantage, except spiritual advantages, granted to the members of the church above others. Would, I say, this church imply *comprehension* instead of *selection*? And would it not tend to make Christianity known to the whole population in a degree not easily to be calculated?

It does not indeed appear, that any thing of a secular nature (unless the decent maintenance of ministers be *secularity*,) would be at all connected with such an establishment. In fact, the political effect of *our* establishment, though probably considerable in the higher circles, is scarcely at all felt by the lower orders even of the clergy: and I have certainly been taught to understand the source, nature, and effects of that political tendency, far more from the writings of dissenters, than either from my own experience, or the discourse and conduct, or writings of my brethren in the church of England. I do not think,

that my conduct, even in respect of an election of a member of parliament, was ever different as a churchman, from what it would have proved had I been a dissenter; according to the views that I deem myself bound to act upon as to kings and all in authority, whether in the establishment or out of it.

There may, however, be some exceptions even in our circle and company; but the most of us, at least in England, have little secular advantage from an adherence to the church. I have been used occasionally to associate with dissenting ministers who had much more than double my income; and it might sometimes occur to me, that possibly I might in this respect fare better by leaving the church than by continuing in it. In fact, political matters have been so little in my thoughts while reflecting on these subjects, that in my strictures on Messrs. H. and their party, I never once thought of their political creed, but merely adverted to their conduct as to establishments, and to those ministers who adhered to them; and indeed as to every thing which had the stamp of antiquity. I have heard, with pleasure, that they have changed their political views and conduct much for the better; and I am sure I have no personal disrespect to them: though, in defending what they have assaulted, some notice must be taken of them; and perhaps this was done too strongly.

Some also compare our reference to the Old Testament, in respect of establishments, with that of the papists in support of their persecuting principles. But where in the Old Testament is

any sanction given to persecution? God commanded Moses, and Joshua, and Israel, to execute his vengeance on certain nations who had "filled "up the measure of their sins:" and he commanded that idolaters and blasphemers should be put to death, as violators of the fundamental laws of that community to which they belonged. But where did he command or sanction persecution? Were the Israelites ever required to make war against the surrounding nations, and compel them, at the point of the sword, to be circumcised and embrace the religion of Moses? Were they required to use compulsion in bringing back the ten tribes, even when they had set up an idolatrous and schismatic religion under Jeroboam? Was Rehoboam even allowed to make war against them? Did David, Jehoshaphat, and Hezekiah effect their several revivals of true religion by persecution; or by scriptural instruction, invitation, persuasion, and kindness? All that looks like persecution in the Old Testament, is the reprobated conduct of Saul towards the Gibeonites;[1] that of Jeroboam towards the priests and Levites, and pious Israelites;[2] and that of the princes of Ahab's line towards the prophets, and worshippers of Jehovah; and that of Jehu towards the worshippers of Baal, which received no divine sanction: and in general the persecution of prophets and saints by wicked kings:—unless it were persecution in Elijah to put the priests of Baal to death, as condemned to die by God himself.—I must, therefore, consider all such intimations,

[1] 2 Sam. xxi. [2] 2 Chron. xi.

whether by papists or others, as a kind of slander on the Old Testament, and on God who gave it: as if he were not the same unchangeable God who gave the New Testament also. But, alas! such slanders are very common; and not unfrequently adopted even by pious men!

When the incestuous Corinthian was separated from the church of Corinth and the intimate communion of Christians, and specially from the Lord's supper, was he excluded also from public worship, and all public means of grace? Might he not, if desirous, attend as a hearer of the gospel; at least in the same manner as the unbelievers were admitted?[1] If he might not, how was he to be restored? Without means, or by means? An exclusion from all public means of grace would certainly give a new view of that subject, as implied in excommunication; and is a topic in this controversy of peculiar importance, and requires some clear answer to the question; though I merely hint at it. This, however, every one, who has tried and observed, may know, that the person himself, and all whom it concerns, within or without, do understand sufficiently, for all practical purposes, the censure under which a man lies, while excluded from the Lord's supper, and withdrawn from by Christians, (except as his good and recovery is attempted,) though he be allowed in other respects to attend the place of worship as before.

Disputants often speak of the whole population of a parish, whatever their profession and their

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25.

conduct, being recognised as participants. On this I would inquire, What is meant by *participants* and *communion?* If merely being nominal members of the church, whether of England or Scotland, be intended, then let it pass: but, if *communion* implies admission to the Lord's table, the assertion is very far indeed from being well founded. In most parts of England especially, it is well known that by far the greater number of the population of almost every parish, in fact, in this particular excommunicates itself. In parishes of a thousand inhabitants, frequently there are not more than thirty or forty communicants, and often much fewer; and the whole number who at any time attend, comes much short of a hundred. In one view this is very lamentable: yet, as far as the situation of a pious minister is concerned, it gives him considerable advantage, in preserving his *increasing* number more pure than our opponents are aware of;—for he may expect an increase of the number, but should not too eagerly press it. In general, except in a few individuals, (seldom of openly irreligious or immoral character,) who have been accustomed to attend too often in a formal or self-righteous manner, he finds more difficulty in prevailing with the people to come to the Lord's supper, than in preventing their attendance. The rubric also is so worded as to give an important advantage to those ministers, who are desirous to "do what they "can" to prevent the profanation of the Lord's supper. 'So many as intend to be partakers of 'the holy communion shall signify their names to 'the curate, at least some time the day before.

'And, if any of those be an open and notorious 'evil liver, or have done any wrong to his neigh-'bours by word or deed, so that the congrega-'tion be thereby offended; the curate, having 'knowledge thereof, shall call him, and advertise 'him, that in any wise he presume not to come to 'the Lord's table, until he hath openly declared 'himself to have truly repented, and amended his 'former naughty life; that *the congregation may 'thereby be satisfied, which before were offended.*'[1] It is, indeed, to be regretted, that this is so very seldom acted upon: yet it sometimes is; and I will venture to affirm, in part from experience, that, in proportion as it is acted upon, a great part of the evil objected to our establishment, *on this ground*, may be prevented, without having recourse to authoritative and legal excommunication. Where a pious and consistent clergyman (at least in a country parish,) impartially proceeds in the method prescribed by the rubric, with mildness and firmness, he will not find many, if any, continuing to attend at the Lord's table, after he has solemnly warned them not to presume to do so, unless they give satisfactory proof of repentance and amendment; appealing to the rubric as his rule and authority in thus warning them. There are indeed cases in many congregations, in which a man, to act faithfully, must venture painful consequences, which he ought to do without shrinking; and this indeed too often, proving a strong temptation, shews that the communion is not so pure as it might be; but not that it is 'as

[1] Rubric before Communion Service.

'*impure* as it can be.' And the objection even here lies against the particular establishment, nay generally in great measure on the ministers, and is not essential to the very nature of an establishment.

Besides this, much, very much, may be done by faithful preaching, and clear explanations of the nature, profession, and obligation of baptism and the Lord's supper; by private counsel and admonition; and in a variety of ways, which I the more wonder should never have occurred to the thoughts of those opposers who have been ministers of an establishment. By means of this kind, I have generally been able to induce most of those whose presence I did not approve, quietly to withdraw. At the same time that I state this, as my experience, *I deeply regret* that I have attempted nothing more regular and consistent in the admission of communicants; and in superintending, instructing, and admonishing such as attended. Much more, I am persuaded, might be done, *according to the rubric*, in most situations, without either an appeal to the diocesan, or giving umbrage to him. And were these means more generally adopted, they would gradually become less offensive, even to superior neighbours; if in other things, ministers acted inoffensively, kindly, courteously, and peaceably:—at least it would be well worth their while to make the trial.

Many opponents of establishments assert, that the word rendered *church*, when applied to the Christians in any city or place, means one single congregation meeting for worship in the same place. But is this scriptural? We frequently

read of the church at Jerusalem: did this church consist of a single congregation meeting in one place? The number at an early period amounted very nearly to five thousand men, (ἀνδρῶν,) exclusively, as it would seem, of women and children.[1] Afterwards we read that there were "many ten "thousands" that "believed:" πόσαι μυριάδες.[2] Did all these meet for worship in one place? for certainly they were all one church. They had also many elders, besides the apostles: were these all placed over one congregation? This would be very little like the practice of those in modern times, who plead for 'primitive Christianity,' against establishments. The same may be observed in respect of the elders of Ephesus, and the church of Ephesus.[3] We admit, indeed, that the word did not include the whole population of any city or country; for there was no establishment of any kind. But, if some extend the meaning of the word too largely, others narrow it much more than accords with scripture: and Independents generally restrict it to the communicants, to the exclusion of most of the congregation.—Again, it is assumed that the whole church at Jerusalem met together, to frame and sanction the decree of what is commonly called 'the first 'general council.' But let us carefully attend to the narrative. "When Paul and Barnabas came "to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, "and of the apostles and elders; and they de- "clared all things that God had done with them.

[1] Acts iv. 4. [2] Acts xxi. 20. [3] Acts xx. 17—35.

"Then there arose up certain of the Pharisees "which believed, saying that it was needful to "circumcise them, and to command them to keep "the law of Moses. Then *the apostles and elders* "came together for to consider of this matter."[1] Here is no intimation that any came together but "the apostles and elders:" and it is highly unreasonable to suppose that all the Christians assembled on the occasion. We cannot rate the number of Christians at this time in the church of Jerusalem, at less than ten thousand persons: probably it was far more. Now how, even in popular governments, do the mass of people consent to public measures, but by their representatives? However chosen, (certainly not in *defiance* of the will of the other Christians,) the elders with the apostles were their representatives; and what they unanimously decreed was the act of the whole church. These spoke the sense of the body at large; though probably there were some dissentients.—Perhaps some other select persons might also form a part of the assembly, though there is no intimation of it.

It has been said, that the twenty-third article of our church sets aside all preaching and ministration, not sanctioned by 'ecclesiastical officers 'appointed by the crown.' No doubt those who framed this article intended to condemn all public preaching and ministering of sacraments by *unordained* persons; the propriety of which practice, or the contrary, constitutes a question of

[1] Acts xv. 4—6.

itself, which has divided the opinions of the wisest and best men, in different ages of the church.[1] But mark the cautious language of the article: 'Those we ought to judge lawfully called and 'sent, which be chosen and called to this work by 'men who have public authority given unto them 'in the congregation, to call and send ministers 'into the Lord's vineyard.'—Let us next hear the fair and just interpretation of this by one of our bishops, of high authority on such subjects. 'That 'which is simply necessary as a means to preserve 'the order and union of the body of Christians, 'and to maintain the reverence due to holy things, 'is, that no man enter upon any part of the holy 'ministry, without he be chosen and called to it, 'by such as have an authority so to do, that, I say, 'is fixed by the article: but men are left more at 'their liberty, as to their thoughts concerning the 'subject of this lawful authority. That which 'we believe to be *lawful authority*, is that rule 'which the body of the pastors, or bishops and 'clergy of a church shall settle; being met in a 'body under the due respect to the powers that 'God shall set over them.'—'They who drew the 'article had the state of the several churches be-'fore their eyes, that had been differently re-'formed.'[2] Much more occurs in explaining this, and applying it to the case of Christians, where there is no establishment, and under persecution. I am persuaded, that Bishop Burnet gives the meaning of those who drew the article correctly;

[1] See note in the author's Commentary on Acts viii. 4.

[2] Burnet on the Articles.

and that, though episcopal themselves, they never meant to deny the validity of Lutheran, or even Presbyterian, ordination: and let it not be forgotten, that Independency, however modified, had not then appeared, in modern churches at least; yet with a little allowance on this ground, the article may take in all regularly ordained ministers, even among the Independents.

In respect to all objections against the use of a liturgy, however excellent it may be, I would just observe, that all the psalmody at the temple was by a preconceived form, as psalmody in general must be; that a form of blessing was appointed, in which the priests were to bless the congregation of Israel;[1] that our Lord taught his disciples a form, saying, "When ye pray, say, &c.:" and that the request of the disciples, that he would teach them to pray, "as John taught his dis-"ciples," implies that he had taught them some form.[2] Our Lord also instituted a form for the administration of baptism. I am not disposed to urge the objections against extemporary prayer, which numbers do; not being much afraid lest a pious minister should present requests, to which I cannot say, Amen. But *comprehension*, as far as I have heard, is often wanting; many things that should be included, are wholly omitted, while others are enlarged on with needless repetition. Indeed many of those, who do not fail in this way, avoid it merely by adopting a method, in arranging the several parts of their prayers, supplications, and thanksgivings, in a manner which

[1] Num. vi. 22—27. [2] Luke xi. 1—4.

assimilates it to a liturgy. Men of fervent piety and ability perform this often in a very edifying and affecting manner: but, considering all things, I must in present circumstances esteem our liturgy as, even in this view, a great advantage; while the cases above stated shew it not unlawful in itself.

I. In respect of establishments in themselves.

II. Some thoughts on the advantages arising from our establishment.

I. What I mean to add to that which I before wrote on establishments, will be comprised under one topic, namely, The state of things under the Old Testament; compared with some of the prophecies concerning the future glorious times of the church.

It seems conceded, even by those who consider establishments as necessarily *secular* and *political*, and inconsistent with Christianity, that the church of Israel was an establishment; and yet, in the modern sense of the word, it could scarcely be called so till the times of David and Solomon. The Lord however appointed the sacerdotal order, and the Levites as assistants: he allotted a certain portion, yea a large portion, of the produce of Canaan for their maintenance; he connected the priesthood very closely with the political government, under Moses, Joshua, and the judges, till the days of Saul; and afterwards with that of the kings of David's race: and these priests were not only sacrificers, but the regular teachers of Israel. Now this was the Lord's own doing. The question then occurs, Was this establishment secular, po-

litical, and inconsistent with spiritual religion, and with Israel being a true church? Did God himself appoint in religion those things which are in their own nature inconsistent with spiritual religion? things wrong in themselves? I plead not for the divine right of this or the other form of church government; or for this or the other establishment; or even for the *necessity* of an establishment: I only state that, whatever faults there may be in any existing establishment, or in any that have existed, the thing cannot be evil *per se*. Otherwise God expressly *appointed*, and not only *permitted*, what was evil *per se*. Was spiritual religion under that dispensation, one thing, and under the Christian dispensation, another thing? Or was there no spiritual religion then? Was not the law itself spiritual? and were not many Israelites eminently spiritually minded? If God be unchangeable, true religion, as to its essence, must be the same: and, beyond doubt, the rule of duty, and the way of acceptance and of sanctification, were the same in substance, though the external administration differed. I cannot indeed consider the argument against establishments *per se*, especially as expressed sometimes in most unqualified language, as any thing less than a censure of what God himself actually instituted. We prove that oaths are not in themselves unlawful, because expressly appointed by God; and by the same rule we may prove that establishments are not evil *per se*, because allowedly appointed by God.

Again, did not all the pious kings of Judah, without exception, take the lead in matters of re-

ligion, even to the exhorting, commanding, directing, encouraging, nay, censuring of the priests and Levites; the regular ministers of religion? Did they not also enforce the laws for the payment of the tithes and other dues to the priests and Levites? Were they not in those things accepted, and commended, and encouraged, by prophets, and by the inspired writers; and this in proportion to their zeal, decision, and activity, as regulated according to the word of God? Were not those kings who neglected to do these things proportionably blamed, even when not directly idolatrous and wicked? Did not Ezra and Nehemiah, after the captivity, do the same? Did they not even consider heathen kings entitled to their gratitude, who countenanced and aided them; and exempted the ministers of religion from toll and impost?[1] Now could that be "right, and "good, and truth,"[2] in Hezekiah, or Josiah, or Nehemiah, which would be wrong, *per se*, in a Christian king? Circumstances may vary: but the thing could not be simply secular and political.—Two things are clear in this view of the Old Testament history: first, that an establishment may be founded and superintended by pious princes, without requiring any thing except what the word of God requires;[3] and, secondly, that it may be thus acceptable to God, and peculiarly useful to mankind. I do not say that an establishment *must* be formed over the true Israel, because it was over the typical Israel: but are not nations, where

[1] Ezra vii. 13—28. [2] 2 Chron. xxx. 20, 21.
[3] 2 Chron. xxx. 12.

Christianity is known, and to whom "are com-"mitted the oracles of God," in nearly the same state as the nation of Israel was? And may not the same means conduce to increase the number of *true* Christians among *nominal* Christians, as were of old blessed to increase the number of *true* Israelites among *nominal* Israelites; and would it not be better to endeavour to state clearly, how existing establishments might be improved, and rendered more efficacious; than, by condemning the thing itself, in one sweeping sentence, to arm all establishments, in self-defence, to support unaltered, and unimproved, the whole existing system?

Again, do not the prophecies clearly foretell that "kings shall be nursing fathers, and their "queens nursing mothers" to the true Israelites?[1] and that they shall bring "gold and incense, and "shew forth the praises of the Lord?" "Kings "shall minister unto thee, &c."[2] Surely this implies that they shall use their wealth, and influence, and authority, in something of the same manner as Jehoshaphat, and Hezekiah, and Josiah did, to support and maintain the worship of God, according to his word, in their several dominions:[3] and as Nehemiah did, after the captivity.[4]

The vision in the latter chapters of Ezekiel[5] is indeed, very obscure in many respects; but it is generally admitted to predict future events, and to relate to the approaching Millennium. The waters,

[1] Isa. xlix. 23. [2] Isa. lx. 1—14.

[3] 2 Chron. xvii. 4—9. xix. xxix. 3—11. xxx. 1—12, 22, 24. xxxi. 2—19, 20, 21. xxxv. 6—18.

[4] Neh. x. 19—29. [5] xl.—xlviii.

flowing from the threshold of the house, and growing wider and deeper in their progress,[1] evidently refer to the same events, which Isaiah and Micah predict, under the emblem of "the mountain of the Lord's house being established on the "top of the mountains, and all nations flowing "unto it:"[2] and Daniel, "as the stone cut out of "the mountain without hands, and becoming a "great mountain and filling the whole earth."[3] This seems decisive that the vision does not refer exclusively to Israel, and their restoration, but to the general prevalence of Christianity throughout the earth, going forth from the sanctuary, and holy city, into all the nations. And let it be observed that the city is never called Jerusalem, nor the land Canaan. "The name of the city from "that day shall be called, THE LORD IS THERE, "JEHOVAH *shammah*." "Lo, I am with you al"ways, even unto the end of the world." Now the very things, in many respects, are ascribed in this vision to the prince, or princes, which the pious kings of Judah did, with acceptance and usefulness, before the captivity; and Ezra and Nehemiah after the captivity.[4] Still a stated and large proportion of the land is allotted for the support of the ministers of religion, which must not be sold, or alienated; and the prince, or princes, are stated as bearing the expenses of the worship.[5] Now I do not mean to argue for the divine right of tithes, or for any thing in particular which now

[1] xlvii. 1—12. [2] Isa. ii. 2—5. Mic. iv. 1—3.
[3] Dan. ii. 34, 35, 44, 45. [4] Ezek. xlv. 9—17. xlvi. 1—8.
[5] Ezek. xlviii. 9—20.

exists: but, if there be any meaning in these prophecies, kings and princes, in the predicted time, will have a more important station in religious concerns allotted to them, and take a more active, and liberal, and decided part in them, than the opposers of all establishments are willing should be assigned to them. If there be any instruction in these prophecies, (and they were "written for our "learning,") it cannot be a thing evil *per se* to provide a regular and stated maintenance for the ministers of religion, even when funds for that purpose did not previously exist: it could not be evil *in itself* (whatever the motive might be in those who did it, or however they might exceed all due proportion) for men to devote a portion of their estates to the service of the sanctuary, and the support of its ministers: it cannot be evil in itself to reserve this portion, or what remains of it, or is needful, for the same purposes at present, however it may be improperly parcelled out, or disposed of: nor can it be evil in itself to add to it, if exigencies, not to be supplied by a more equitable distribution of the existing fund, do require it. Nay, it cannot be wrong in itself for kings and princes to interpose, even in respect of the ministers of religion, and to require those who are supported as such to attend to the duties of their station according to the word of God, and according to such explanation of the word as they have *voluntarily* consented to. These things cannot be wrong in themselves, unless what God has recorded of his ancient servants, and predicted concerning his future servants, be wrong in itself.

It is admitted by some, that many things of this

nature may be done by kings and princes without an establishment. But can a more effectual method be formed of giving religious instruction, and affording opportunities of religious worship, to those who can be induced voluntarily to attend on these means of grace, through any country, than by distributing it into districts and parishes, building places of worship in all proper situations, and stationing ministers to officiate in these places of worship, statedly, and especially on the Lord's day, under pious superintendents, who may see to it that they properly attend to their duty; encouraging those who do so, and censuring or superseding, those who do not? I cannot doubt that a plan of this kind, if superintended and conducted by truly pious characters, might go very far, by the blessing of God, in evangelizing the inhabitants: I say by the blessing of God, which in this case might be expected, and without which even the efforts of what is pleaded for as 'primitive 'Christianity' must be useless.—It especially seems important, in procuring a willing observation of the Christian sabbath throughout any country. Many, perhaps, would object to any constraint in this also; and certainly what is done freely and willingly, and merely by instruction and persuasion, is far preferable; and, wherever a stated parish minister is punctual and earnest in his duties, it may generally be observed that, even when no constraint is used, the Lord's day is proportionably hallowed by his parishioners, with fewer exceptions by far than in the other places. The plan adopted by Jehoshaphat might also, from

time to time, come in aid of it with great effect.[1]

The Independents in general, as far as I can learn, consider the ministerial character conferred, or recognized, when the person whom they have chosen is ordained pastor over that special church, as distinct from his pastoral relation to them: they can dismiss him from the latter, and another church may choose him; but reordination is not required, and his ministerial character is deemed permanent. Whether he is at liberty, *in foro conscientiæ*, to renounce it, forms another question.

If Christian ministers derive their office merely from men, and are properly their ministers, they may be set aside by the same authority as appointed them: but the New Testament constantly speaks of them, as the "ministers of God, and of Christ."[2] And the apostle in addressing the elders of Ephesus says, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all "the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made "you overseers."[3] Now, has man authority to disannul what the Holy Ghost has done? Even if the overseer, whom the Holy Ghost hath made, should on any account be removed from his original charge: do not his office and character remain indelible, except taken away by him who delegated them? Man has, almost in every age, had some assigned part in forming or recognising the mar-

[1] See the Author's Commentary on 2 Chron. xvii. 7—9.

[2] 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2. 2 Cor. vi. 3. xi. 23. Col. i. 7. iv. 17.

[3] Acts xx. 28.

riage union; yet our Lord says, concerning it, "Those whom God hath joined together, let no "man put asunder." I will not say, that no earthly power can deprive a minister of his office, who has forfeited it by his misconduct; but no record is given of the transaction in the New Testament; and I cannot conceive that the churches, over which the apostles, and Timothy and Titus ordained pastors, (by whomsoever chosen,) were competent, without consulting either apostle or evangelist, or other pastors and churches, both to set them aside, and deprive them of the office conferred "by the laying on of the hands of the "presbytery."[1]

II. I proceed now to the last subject on which I purpose to give my thoughts; namely, the advantages arising to the cause of true religion from our national establishment, its provisions, liturgy, articles, and homilies; whatever faults, real or supposed, may be found in its constitution and its administration.

Supposing at the beginning of the last century, or towards the middle of it, the same number of pious ministers and Christians had been found in the land as there then were, and no more; and these without any advantage from an establishment, either of one kind or another; without churches, or episcopal chapels, or services on the Lord's day, or any thing Christian even in appearance, except in the places of worship belonging to this select company, separated from the rest of

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 14. v. 22.

the nation, according to the form of independent churches, of a more ancient or more modern description: and supposing this to have been the case for a length of time preceding it; would the bulk of the population have differed much from the inhabitants of heathen countries? Would not even the more common notions of Christianity have been almost obliterated? Would not the very observance of the sabbath, especially as to attendance on public worship, have been nearly worn out; and all other regard to it, except as supported by the disallowed weapons of legal coercion? Would not the supply of truly pious ministers from our schools and colleges have been in a great degree, if not entirely, prevented? Or, if any young man, educating for some other profession, becoming attentive to true religion, should have chosen the work of the ministry, must he not have been shut out from the opportunity of exercising his ministry, where it was most wanted? For, without some *legal* and *strong* measures from the secular arm, it cannot be supposed that the chartered seminaries of learning would have shared their funds with the religious party. How far some kind of idolatry would have sprung up in such a desert, I cannot say; but example shews that it commonly does return, in one form or other, under such circumstances. All, however, who had not been led to join the independent churches, and either to receive admission into them, or to attend at their places of religion, would have greatly resembled heathens in ignorance and ungodliness: and it is not without many lamentable exceptions, that even the

independent churches have preserved, in any good measure, the evangelical faith among them. The office of minister in such circumstances must have greatly resembled that of a missionary in Pagan or Mohammedan countries; except as the small number, at the time above stated, of these churches were concerned: and I believe it will be allowed, that, under God, the increase of them has been much owing to the labours of ministers in the establishment. Every thing inculcated concerning the grand truths and duties of Christianity must have been either wholly new, or considered as the notion of comparatively a small party; and have met with as decided opposition, at least, as from Mohammedans. But now our parish churches and parish ministers, and Lord's day services, and various other observances, even when formal and inefficient, keep up in men's minds some idea of Christianity: and, when a minister who is earnest to do good, and "well instructed to the "kingdom of God," is brought into any place, he finds a great many things ready prepared to his hand, which missionaries excessively feel the want of: a place of worship; a general conviction that the Lord's day should be observed; a cessation of most kinds of labour; leisure to those who choose to attend on public worship; an extended *opinion*, at least, that the scriptures are the word of God; with many other advantages, not to be found in heathen countries, and greatly relieving those difficulties under which missionaries at first labour, and over which they mourn.

Even that degree of attendance on public worship, which is found in the most formal or neg-

lected parishes, gives a great advantage to a pious minister, who seldom fails greatly to increase it; while some attend from a partiality, ignorant indeed, to the parish church, who would not hear the same truths in another place on any account; and while they continue to quarrel with the preacher and his doctrine. Yet it is often found, in the event, that some of these very persons are at length won over. Though the manner in which the liturgy and scriptures are read in too many places greatly prevents the good which, apart from preaching, might be expected from them, as means of instruction; they certainly produce in men's minds such a general knowledge of Christian truth and duty, as missionaries would gladly find in the heathens among whom they labour; and which opens the way to their understanding of instruction which would otherwise be wholly unintelligible: while quotations from the liturgy, the articles, and the homilies, give the preacher an advantage which he otherwise could not have. It may be said, 'this arises from preju-'dice.' Be it so: but he who will not avail himself of men's prejudices to attempt their good, as far as he conscientiously is able, has not well studied the state of the world, and could not imitate the apostle in "becoming all things "to all men, that by all means he might save "some."[1]

Even the administration of the sacraments (though, alas! too generally formal,) keeps up in men's minds ideas of Christian doctrine, to a de-

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 19—21.

gree that is not generally considered. Original sin, regeneration, or a renewal to holiness by the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of the Trinity, and many other coincident points of Christianity, are continually brought before the attention of the members of the establishment by the administration of infant-baptism, and by the catechism generally taught their children: and, when a pious minister comes among persons who have even these mere inefficient notions, no tongue can express how much labour is spared, which, without them, would be indispensible and most discouraging. He can appeal to the liturgy, the catechism, and the form of baptism, and its professions and exhortations: he can argue, persuade, and expostulate with children, parents, sponsors, and all concerned, on the ground of them; he can silence the charge of novelty by arguments of which they must feel the force, whether they will or not.—The same may be said of the doctrine of the atonement, and faith in the Lord Jesus, by means of the Lord's supper; and of "the great mystery of godliness" by means of both sacraments: while the confessions, both in the general service and at the communion, and the collects, and litany, afford him a never-failing source of illustration, explanation, and *argumentum ad hominem*; which often is more silencing and convincing than any other argument. In short, he performs his journey on a road formed to his hand, while the missionary must urge his course through forests and morasses, over rivers and mountains, as well as he can: and who does not perceive, that these are vast advantages arising from an establishment?

It has been stated, that few, if any, instances occur in which conversion takes place by means of the reading of our evangelical liturgy and the scriptures in the places of worship: and I would be far from considering this, apart from faithful preaching, as *adequate* to the religious instruction of any congregation or parish, in the manner which many do. Yet I have met with instances, in which, as far as I could judge, conversion had been effected, through God's grace, by means of the church service exclusively: but especially I have known several individuals, conscientious, dissatisfied with themselves, yet ignorant, and even prejudiced against the preachers of the gospel, but greatly attached to the church; who, when the gospel was brought to them on their own ground, soon found it was precisely the thing which they wanted, and embraced it in some respects after the same manner as Cornelius did the message of Peter, only by a more gradual progress. Among these some instances have occurred under my own ministry, of persons of seventy or eighty years of age, who ended their lives usefully and happily.

The situation of a parish minister has also the following advantage. It is conceded that his parishioners are his proper charge; and he is supposed to be doing nothing but what may be reasonably expected from him, when by kind and lenient, yet firm measures, he urges each individual to attend on the worship of God, and uses other means, by private exhortation, admonition, and persuasion, of influencing them to mind the one thing needful; or puts tracts into the

hands of each parishioner, for this purpose; and when, even uncalled, he visits the house of sickness and mourning, with his instructions and prayers. In this licensed preachers are not confined to the form of visitation, as many imagine, but left in great measure to their own discretion; as indeed they are in many respects far beyond what is generally supposed. In these, and various other ways, the parish minister has access to those whom he could not by other means readily approach: and, even when unwelcome, he stands on ground on which, if he act properly, he cannot be censured; but will have a testimony in the consciences even of those who dislike his intrusion. He has, in respect of others, very many opportunities of attempting good: but here he cultivates as it were his own land, and is blameable if he do not improve his advantages to the utmost.

As to the fact; I have seldom heard even the strictest dissenters deny, that very numerous conversions have taken place under the ministry of those who have laboured, and do labour, in the established church; while the members, and not very unfrequently the ministers, of the dissenting churches were first brought to the knowledge of the gospel by their labours, or rather by the blessing of God on those labours:—for "this hath "God wrought." The conduct, however, of the apostles, who saw one "casting out devils in "Christ's name, and forbade him, because he "followed not with them," has been more imitated, among all parties, than the admonition of our Lord on the occasion has been duly regarded;

else so many methods would not have been used, of weakening the hands, and drawing off the congregations, of pious clergymen.

I once conversed with a dissenter, who observed, that he had heard one of his brethren express a wish that there were no pious ministers in the establishment. On further inquiry I found that he, who thus expressed himself, did not doubt that God converted many sinners by the ministry of such pious clergymen: but he added, The person who informed me said, that, if there had been no pious clergy, God would have brought those sinners to the meeting, and there have converted them. The answer which I gave to this was obvious: Your friend supposes, then, that the only wise God has formed a plan for the accomplishing of his gracious purposes, and is carrying it into effect by his special grace; but that, if God would have consulted *him*, he could have suggested a better plan!

The persons concerned may indeed take wrong steps, and be left under some mistakes and prejudices. But can we suppose that God evidently prospered what he entirely and totally disapproved? and that he crowned, and still crowns, with success the labours of those in the establishment, who are in duty bound to come out from it; nay, would be so if the establishment were ever so unexceptionable? If "he that winneth "souls be wise;" he who continues, as far as he can conscientiously, where he has peculiar opportunities of winning souls, and where God crowns his labour, and that of his brethren, with much success, cannot be very unwise. But verily I

think he would be unwise, who, without any very urgent reason should quit a situation in which he possesses advantages for this most important of all objects, such as he probably could not soon meet with elsewhere.

I am, dear Sir,

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS SCOTT.

AN ESSAY

ON THE

RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL.

It is generally admitted by all parties, in controversies about establishments, that the religion of the Old Testament, or rather the religion of Israel under the Mosaic dispensation, was an establishment, whatever conclusions they may attempt to deduce from the acknowledged fact. It may, however, be worth while to inquire, in what sense this was really the case.

The circumstance, indeed, that from Adam to Moses (above 2500 years) true religion was found on earth, without an establishment, or any thing resembling one; and yet that at the end of that period God himself formed an establishment; shews that true piety may subsist either without an establishment or under one; that an external change in the situation of those who profess true religion may render an establishment highly expedient and beneficial, when before that change it could hardly have been admissible; and that the case of the Old Testament church, from the first promise to the coming of the Messiah, was not in this respect totally dissimilar to that of the New

Testament church in the primitive times, and since the days of Constantine to the present age. While no nation, as such, professed to worship JEHOVAH alone, and no rulers or kings were found among his worshippers, no traces are met with of an establishment in the Old Testament any more than in the New, or in the New Testament church in similar circumstances. But when the descendents of Abraham were grown up into a nation, professing the worship of Jehovah, and living under rulers of the same religion, then an establishment was formed; in what way, and of what kind, remains to be investigated. The law of Moses, indeed, established the worship of JEHOVAH, the Creator of the world, and the Lord of all things, to the entire exclusion of all other names or beings, which either then were, or ever could be, supposed to be gods, or lords, or objects of adoration; and expressly forbad the use of all images or likenesses, whether of God or of creatures, in religious worship. Death also was denounced, as the punishment to be inflicted by the people, or rulers, on every detected idolater in Israel; and utter destruction upon every city in Israel which turned aside to idolatry.[1]

The worship also to be conducted, first at the tabernacle, and afterwards at the temple built in the place which the "Lord should choose to place "his name there," was regulated in a very circumstantial manner by the ceremonial law; while very many of its requirements were obligatory on all Israelites, in every part of the land or of the

[1] Deut. xiii.

earth. Yet no penalty, to be inflicted by the rulers, was appointed, except, perhaps, for offering sacrifices elsewhere than at the altar, in the court of the tabernacle.[1]

The descendents of Levi likewise were appointed to be the ministers of religion to the other tribes; the family of Aaron to be the priests, to sacrifice and burn incense before the Lord; and the high priest was constituted their head, or principal, especially to inquire of the Lord by urim and thummim, and to perform the services of the great day of atonement: and an ample provision was allotted to them out of the estates and cities of the other tribes.

It is, moreover, evident, that the priests and Levites were the divinely appointed regular instructors of the people in religion, and stationed for that purpose in cities in every part of the land.[2]

Nor can it be reasonably doubted, that some of them at least, in every age, understood this, and diligently endeavoured to instruct the people. It may therefore be supposed that, besides the stated worship at the sanctuary, social or public worship, by prayers and thanksgivings, and public instructions, were given, under the inspection or superintendence of the more conscientious priests and Levites while at their own homes: at least this ought to have been done. Yet there were no regulations given respecting these devotions and in-

[1] Lev. xvii. 1—9. [2] Deut. xxxiii. 10. 2 Chron. xvii. 7—10. xxx. 22. xxxv. 3. Ezra. vii. 10—25. Neh. viii. 7. Mic. iii. 11. Mal. ii. 7.

structions; no prescribed forms or methods of worship; nothing, in the modern sense, like an establishment.

The priests and Levites were also the ordinary judges or magistrates in their several districts; and the high priest, with those chief priests who more statedly resided at or near the sanctuary, seems to have been appointed as a supreme court, to which appeals lay from all parts of the land.[1] Yet still, as Joshua succeeded Moses, and gave directions and commands to the priests,[2] so it was intimated that there would generally be judges, or rulers, distinct from the priests; and that an union, or alliance, or mutual cooperation, was intended to subsist between them. Yet, from the days of Joshua to those of Samuel or David, this union is scarcely noticed. When the other tribes marched against those tribes who had their inheritance to the east of Jordan, and who were supposed to have forsaken the appointed worship at the tabernacle, by building another altar,[3] Joshua is not once mentioned: Phinehas was indeed one of the ambassadors sent on the occasion; but the elders, or heads of the tribes, seem to have conducted the whole business, without much consulting him.

In the book of Judges, neither high priest, nor priests, nor Levites are mentioned in any public transaction, except as Phinehas consulted the Lord for the tribes of Israel, in the almost extirpating war against Benjamin. Sacrifices were offered by

[1] Deut. xvii. 8—13. xix. 16—18. [2] Josh. iii. 6. iv. 16. vi. 6. [3] Josh. xxii.

men of other tribes, by Gideon a Manassite, and Manoah a Danite; and these were accepted by the Lord.[1] Eli, indeed, was both judge and high priest; but his authority was not duly exercised. Whereas Samuel, an ordinary Levite, became a prophet and judge; yet it does not appear that he attended at the tabernacle worship, but offered sacrifices acceptably at other places.[2]

No command is given in the law of Moses as to the form of government of the nation in subsequent ages, whether it was to be that of a king, or not. In the prophetical blessings pronounced on his sons by Israel when dying, it was intimated that Judah would be the ruling tribe. "The "sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-"giver from between his feet, till Shiloh come; "and to him shall the gathering of the people "be."[3] Yet Moses himself, the lawgiver of the nation, was a Levite, and Joshua, his successor, an Ephraimite: the first who took the title of king in Israel, was Abimelech, a Manassite;[4] and the first king whom God appointed over them was Saul the Benjamite.

Some directions, indeed, were given in the law, in case the people should ever choose to have a king over them, from a desire to be like the nations that were round about them.[5] And, if the kings who were afterwards appointed over the nation had observed the directions or injunctions there given to them, the most happy conse-

[1] Judg. vi. 23—28. xiii. 19—22.
[2] 1 Sam. vi. 9. ix. 12. x. 8. xi. 15. xvi. 2. [3] Gen. xlix. 10.
[4] Judg. ix. 6, 8, 12. [5] Deut. xvii. 14—20.

quences would have ensued: especially in this command, "When he sitteth on the throne of his "kingdom, he shall write him a copy of this law "in a book, out of that which is before the priests "and Levites; and it shall be with him, and he "shall read therein all the days of his life; that "he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep "all the words of this law, and these statutes, to "do them; that his heart be not lifted up above "his brethren, and that he turn not aside from "the commandment to the right hand or to the "left." It does not appear from the history that any of the kings *literally* observed this injunction. David was, indeed, remarkably well acquainted with "the law of the Lord;" yet, in one instance, his zeal in religion was not regulated according to it, and he met with a discouraging rebuke for his error: which he having discovered and rectified, his endeavours were accepted and succeeded.[1] It was the peculiar commendation of Hezekiah in his reformation, that "the commandment of the "king and of his princes" was "by the word of "the Lord."[2] And when Josiah began his reformation, not having the law of the Lord before him, he proceeded, as it were, in uncertainty and obscurity; but, when the book of the law was found and brought to him, he regulated every thing according to it, and was accepted and prospered. The case was similar in the efforts of Ezra and Nehemiah. "To the law and to the testi- "mony." Now, so far as Christian princes do, or

[1] 2 Sam. vi. 1 Chr. xiii. 15.
[2] 2 Chr. xxx. 12. xxxi. 20, 21.

ever hereafter shall, comply with the spirit of the command given in the law of Moses to kings over Israel; taking the whole of the oracles of God, as their rule, their line, their plummet, they will imitate Hezekiah and Josiah; their measures will be unexceptionable, highly useful, and mercifully accepted. The deviation, therefore, from the rule is that which is objectionable, not the thing itself. The government of Israel was, strictly speaking, a THEOCRACY. The Lord was Israel's king, in a manner wholly different from his providential dominion over other nations. The elders and the chief priests were his ordinary deputies, or vicegerents; and the high priest, in some respects, as the head of them. But, when circumstances called for extraordinary measures, extraordinary vicegerents in the political administration were raised up by God himself, and called JUDGES, and extraordinary ministers of religion, called PROPHETS, to excite the priests and Levites to their duty, or to supersede their authority, in some respects, for a season; and in some instances the two offices were conjoined in the same person.

Thus the state of the nation continued till the days of Samuel, the most illustrious judge and prophet who had been raised up among them: and yet, just before he was called forth to fill up this twofold most eminent station in Israel, a singular intimation was given that another arrangement would soon be formed. The Lord, having awfully denounced sentence on Eli's family, predicted the translation of the high priesthood from his line, (who was a descendent of Ithamar,) to that of Eleazar and Phinehas: "I will raise me up a

" faithful priest, that shall do according to that " which is in mine heart and in my mind; and I " will build him a sure house, that he may walk " before mine anointed for ever." [1] The Lord's " anointed" here could not mean the high priest; for " this priest would walk before the Lord's " anointed." The Messiah cannot be meant, (except typically) for he is both high priest and king. A king over Israel, therefore, called the Lord's anointed, and the cordial union of a faithful and pious high priest, or line of high priests, to him and to his family, were evidently predicted: and the prophecy was fulfilled when David, and after him Solomon, were the anointed kings over Israel; and when Zadok, of Eleazar's line, superseded Abiathar as high priest, by the express authority of king Solomon. [2] We have also reason to conclude that the descendents of Zadok were in general examples of genuine attachment to the cause of true religion, and cordially affected to kings of David's race; especially to the pious and reforming kings: though, doubtless, there were exceptions, to the high priests as well as to the kings. [3]

Here, as it appears to me, the establishment, properly so called with reference to modern usages, by an union or alliance of kings and high priests, or the ministers of political government and those of ecclesiastical government, first dawned. Saul, indeed, who was " the Lord's anointed," exercised authority, or rather cruelly tyrannized over the

[1] 1 Sam. ii. 35, 36. [2] 1 Kings ii. 26, 27.
[3] Ezek. xliv. 15, 16.

priests, and murdered a great number of them, because they were not, as he thought, sufficiently devoted to his interests.[1] But there was no appearance of union or concert between the kingly authority and the priestly, in any matter of religion, during his whole reign; and, after he had murdered Ahimelech and the priests and their families, "the Lord answered him, neither by "dreams, nor by urim, nor by prophets." The high priest, indeed, of Ahimelech's line was with David, who on several occasions consulted the Lord by him, even before he became king. And Abiathar concurred in David's measures, and continued faithful to him till nearly the end of his life: yet Zadok, the second priest, had increasing influence in David's later days; till, soon after, Abiathar's misconduct made way for Zadok's advancement to the high priesthood. David, no doubt, acted as *a prophet*, and not merely by royal authority, in all his arrangements respecting the priests and the Levites, their courses, and employments, and stations; and in the introduction of psalmody, and music both vocal and instrumental, into the stated services at the sanctuary. Yet, in doing the latter, and in altering the age at which the Levites entered on their services, he in some degree deviated from the exact letter of the Mosaic law, while he carried the spirit of it into the most complete effect.[2] It is, however, undeniable that he, as the Lord's chosen and anointed king, exercised authority over the minis-

[1] 1 Sam. xxi.

[2] Compare Num. v. 47. with 1 Chro. xxiii. 27.

ters of religion, and in many *circumstantials* of religious worship; while, at the same time, not the least alteration was attempted either in the moral law, the *rule of duty*, or in those typical rites which were also the appointed institutions of sacred worship, "shadows of good things to come," and sacramental seals and prefigurations of them. Nay, the directions given by him to Solomon, as to the building of the temple, and things coincident with it, were in no degree formed, or modified, according to his own mind or judgment, but delivered to him immediately from God himself:[1] so different a thing is the ordering of mere circumstantials in worship, from changing the express and essential truths, laws, and sacraments, or ordinances of the sacred oracles.

Had this kind of regal interposition, in the matters of religious worship, ceased with David, or even with Solomon, who, as one of the sacred writers, may also be considered as a prophet; little use could have been made of it, as to the interposition of any other kings, either in Israel, or in nations professing Christianity: but, as we shall see, the other kings of Judah, the most pious of them especially, though in no sense prophets, imitated the grand outline of David and Solomon's example, in a manner by no means marked as dissimilar to that of Christian kings and rulers over their ecclesiastics, as to the circumstantials of religion, in those countries in which establishments have been formed; but some of them, at least, in general, after a more scriptural manner

[1] 1 Chr. xxviii. 11—19.

than has generally been hitherto done. This, as it appears to me, proves that the establishment of religion in Israel, by an union and combination, or alliance, of the regal and priestly authorities, grew up long after the introduction of the Mosaic dispensation; and, under God, arose out of the altered circumstances in which the nation was placed, in a manner greatly resembling that in which Christian establishments arose, some ages after the first introduction of Christianity; and also that the grand objection to establishments under Christianity has arisen hitherto, not from the nature of the thing itself, but from the real or supposed want of accordance in the several establishments, and the measures on which they have been conducted and supported to the sacred oracles.

From the times of David and Solomon, we constantly read of the kings of that race employing, directing, and commanding the priests and Levites, and even the high priest himself; and the conduct both of the kings and of the ministers of religion is recorded with approbation or disapprobation, according as the one gave orders and instructions grounded in the law of God, or contrary to it; and as the other promptly obeyed and executed the scriptural commands, and resisted, or complied with, such as were antiscriptural.

When Jeroboam, to support his kingdom over the ten tribes, which had revolted from Rehoboam and submitted to him as king, established the worship of the golden calves at Dan and Bethel, in all probability he would have gladly employed the priests and Levites in carrying into effect his

antiscriptural establishment, if they had been sufficiently disposed to compliance: but, when this did not prove to be the case, they were cast off, and other more compliant instruments were substituted in their room. They, therefore, leaving their possessions, along with their employment, migrated with many others, into the kingdom of Judah; highly to their honour, and to that of the other priests and Levites, who seem cordially to have shared their revenues with them. Now, had the kings of Judah, from this time, declined all interposition in matters of religion, because the same *right* which they might claim in doing this, Jeroboam would claim also for his established idolatry: had they reasoned in this respect from the *data* of some modern opposers of *all kinds* of establishments, what would have been the consequence? Would Jeroboam, "who made Israel "to sin," have renounced his assumed authority in matters of religion, because they renounced their *right*, or rather neglected their *duty*? By no means: a further advantage would have been given to false religion; and true religion would have had to lament that the Asas, Jehoshaphats, Hezekiahs, and Josiahs, had buried their important talent in the earth, for fear of misemploying it, and for fear of sanctioning the measures of those who perverted authority, given by the Lord, in opposing his holy instituted worship.

Rehoboam, however, made no improvement of the advantages which the secession of the priests, and Levites, and other pious Israelites from the kingdom of Jeroboam, afforded him: yet, even the outward regard which his son Abijah paid to

the ministry of the priests, *according to the law*, was rewarded with a most signal and decisive victory over the mighty army of Jeroboam, and all his impious policy.[1]

The kings, who might in subsequent ages rule over Judah, were neither commanded, nor directed by the law, to take the lead in the concerns of religion: yet, in one degree or other, they all did it; nor are they any where blamed simply for thus exercising their authority; the manner in which they used it being exclusively the object of blame or commendation with the inspired historians. The kings in Judah who did this most decidedly, and used all their authority, with their whole heart and soul, in subverting and removing all idolatrous or forbidden worship, and in establishing and supporting the worship at the temple, according to the law, and in other ways promoting the cause of godliness, righteousness, and holiness, are proportionably recorded as approved characters, with honour and commendation. To this there is not one single exception: yet they acted not as *prophets*, nor according to any express commission, or injunction, given to them as kings, by the law of Moses.

Among the rest, Jehoshaphat adopted a measure, admirably indeed suited to the *spirit* of the divine law, but no where required by the *letter* of it; when he sent princes, and with them Levites and priests, "and they taught in Judah, and had "the book of the law of the Lord with them, and "went about throughout all the cities of Judah,

[1] 2 Chr. xiii. 5—17.

"and taught the people."[1] This exercise of authority was no more prescribed to the kings over Israel, in the law of Moses, than a similar conduct is to kings professing Christianity, in the New Testament; and who can help praying, that God would put it into the heart of all kings, called Christian, decidedly and exactly to copy this example of Jehoshaphat?—It is not necessary to go over the reigns of all the approved, or, if I may so speak, half-approved, reigns of the kings of Judah. It will not be denied that all they, who in any degree "obtained a good report" in the word of God, used their authority in matters of religion, and were proportionably commended for so doing; and that the most pious and zealous did this most actively and heartily; and excited, directed, instructed, and even commanded, the priests and Levites to perform their several duties; encouraging such as attended to them, and expressing disapprobation of those who were more negligent and reluctant, till they too were ashamed, and "sanctified themselves."[2] In this even the chief priests, and the high priest himself, were included. But it has not been sufficiently noticed, that no commission or command, requiring this from them, is contained in the law of Moses; nor any hint or counsel of the kind given. It indeed accorded to the spirit of that law, but was not enjoined by the letter of it; and in this light the friends of establishments view the subject under the Christian dispensation.

[1] 2 Chr. xvii. 7—9.

[2] 2 Chr. xxix. 4—11, 34. xxx. 3, 15, 22.

Whenever the kings gave commands in the concerns of religion, or adopted measures, which accorded to the letter or spirit of the law of Moses, the priests and Levites, who most readily and zealously executed their commands, and carried their measures into effect, are spoken of with the greatest approbation. But, when the commandment or conduct of the king was contrary to the law, then the priests were commended or blamed, according as they withstood or complied with the criminal conduct of their misguided prince. Thus the decided conduct of the priests who withstood Uzziah, when he entered into the sanctuary to burn incense contrary to the law, is recorded with honour; [1] while that of Urijah, who, without making any objection, executed the impious orders of wicked Ahaz, is mentioned in a manner which stamps his character with deep and indelible infamy.[2]

Not one of the kings of Judah exercised his authority more fully in the peculiar concerns of religion, than Hezekiah. He was the first mover, director, counsellor, and encourager, in every thing that related to the suppression of idolatry, and irregular worship in the high places, and in establishing the instituted sacred worship of God at the temple; and in all that was connected with the regular attendance of the priests and Levites, and the provision appointed them by the law: [3] and in all this his princes and counsellors concurred with

[1] 2 Chron. xxvi. 16—20. [2] 2 Kings xvi. 10—16.

[3] 2 Kings xviii. 3, 4—22. 2 Chron. xxix. 2—11, 15, 16, 18—36. xxx. 1, 5—12, 22—27. xxxi. 2—5, 11, &c. xxxii. 12.

him, and exercised authority even over the chief priests. But it is expressly and emphatically noticed, that "the commandment thus given by "the king and his princes" was "by the word "of God;" and, therefore, "in Judah the hand of "God was to give them one heart to do the com-"mandment."[1] But, had the commandment been contrary to the word of God, would "the "hand of the Lord have thus given one heart" to the people to obey it? In this respect at least, even he and his princes, as well as the ministers of religion, "can do nothing against the truth, "but for the truth."[2] And, if kings, and counsellors, and senates, employed their authority as Hezekiah and his princes did, the same marked and extensive success might be expected from the same measures; the hand of God would be to give "the people one heart to do the command-"ment of the king and his princes, by the word "of the Lord." This would be the proper improvement of their important talent, and would be accepted and prospered; even as a similar conduct of a rich man, in the use of his riches in supporting and promoting the cause of religion by scriptural means, and no other, is accepted and prospered. "Thus did Hezekiah through-"out Judah, and wrought that which is good, "and right, and truth, before the Lord his God; "and in every work that he began, in the ser-"vice of the house of God, and in the law, and "in the commandments, to seek his God, he did "it with all his heart, and prospered."

[1] 2 Chron. xxx. 12. [2] 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

It may be conceded, that, with not very many exceptions, the commands of kings and princes, in respect of Christian establishments, have by no means been so entirely "by the word of the Lord," as those of Hezekiah were; many, alas! have been *against* it, many *beyond*, many *beside* or *beneath* it: but this is the fault, not of the exercise of all authority, in this respect, but of an undue, an erroneous, and ignorant, or an ungodly exercise of authority.

It is observable, that Hezekiah seems to have made little use of the high priests in inquiring the will of God; but principally consulted Isaiah the prophet: and Josiah sent even the high priest Hilkiah himself to consult the prophetess Huldah, when the book of the law was found, and he was greatly alarmed at what he read in it.[1] Before this time, his exercise of authority in religion, and his orders and commands to the priests and Levites, had not been regulated by any exact rule: but from this event he proceeded more exactly, as Hezekiah had done, "by the word of the Lord;" and his measures were unexceptionable, and met with decided approbation. But his sons, Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, imitating the worst part of Manasseh's conduct, used their authority against the law of God, and against his prophets, and so brought destruction on themselves, and on Judah and Jerusalem.

After the Babylonish captivity, the governors of the restored remnant of Judah concurred with the priests and Levites in the concerns of religion;

[1] 2 Kings xxii. 12—14. 2 Chron. xxxiv.

yet exercised authority over them in the same manner that Hezekiah and Josiah had done: and, while Zerubbabel and others, till the days of Nehemiah, regulated their interference, and the exercise of their authority, in the concerns of religion, according to the holy law of God, their conduct was approved and prospered. But, after a time, the rulers and priests, and the high priests (then become, in some respects, the political rulers of the nation,) too generally "made void the law of "God, to keep their own traditions," or in subserviency to their own interests: and then they were neither approved nor prospered. Thus the exercise of authority in religious concerns was not that in their conduct which was either approved or condemned, but the *scriptural* or *antiscriptural* use of that authority: and why should it not also be the same under the Christian dispensation?

In the most approved conduct of the rulers of Israel and Judah, when exercising authority in the immediate concerns of religion, one thing is peculiarly observable, namely, that they decidedly enforced the payment to the priests and Levites, of those emoluments which had been allotted to them by the divine law, and the proper distribution and division among them of these revenues; while they required them to attend on those services, for the performance of which they had been allotted.[1] But, when no exercise of authority by the ruler intervened, the priests and Levites too generally neglected their special duties; and the

[1] 2 Chr. xxxi. 4—10, 18—21. xxxv. 2—6. Neh. x. 32—39. xiii. 5—13.

people alienated, or appropriated, what was the due and portion of the priests and Levites out of the estates of the other tribes.

Now, as the apostle expressly argues from *the law of Moses*, in respect of the equitable right which the ministers of Christianity have to a maintenance for their labours;[1] what reason can be assigned, why it is not the duty of Christian rulers, to take care that a provision should be allotted to the ministers of religion; and that they who receive it should be required to attend to those services for which it is given; and that those should be most approved and encouraged, who labour with the greatest diligence in the word and doctrine? It is chiefly to be regretted, that the examples of Hezekiah and Nehemiah have not been more exactly imitated: and the deviations from these may be considered as objections to the *unscriptural* use of authority, but not to the *scriptural* exercise of authority in this particular. Indeed, the piety, or the superstition, at least the liberality of our ancestors, appropriated funds for the support of the ministers of religion, and for other religious and beneficent purposes; which, if they had not been diverted into other channels, would have been abundantly sufficient for the purpose: and even, after all depredations, if properly apportioned and distributed, would go far towards rendering any new tax or impost needless. Yet it is manifest, that the largest sums, which could in any case be required to defray the expenses incurred by supporting the

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 9—14.

worship of God, and all things connected with the general instruction of the people, would be comparatively small, when the sums expended by irreligious princes in needless luxury and splendour, or in more criminal pursuits, are considered.

It is in this view observable, that they among the kings and princes of Judah, who (in addition to the legal dues,) most liberally contributed towards the expenses of the instituted worship of God out of their own revenues, or gains, or spoils, or estates, (from David and his immense treasures, dedicated to God, for the building of the temple, to Josiah and his princes,) are never censured by the sacred writers for so doing, but the contrary: some of them also, at least, were in other respects more indisposed to lavish expenditure, than the other kings and princes. Josiah, for instance, was contented with the ancient mansions of his predecessors; as Hezekiah also had been: his expenditure was of another kind:[1] but Jehoiakim his son, whose profaneness equalled his father's piety and holy zeal, brought on himself this awful and instructive rebuke for his profuse magnificence, "Wo unto him that buildeth his house by "unrighteousness and his chambers by wrong; "that useth his neighbour's service without wages, "and giveth him not for his work; that saith, I "will build me a wide house, and large chambers, "and cutteth him out windows, and it is ceiled "with cedar, and painted with vermilion. Shalt "thou reign, because thou closest thyself in cedar?

[1] 2 Chr. xxxv. 7—9.

"Did not thy father eat and drink, and do judg-
"ment and justice, and then it was well with
"him? He judged the cause of the poor and
"needy; then it was well with him. Was not
"this to know me? saith the Lord. But thine
"eyes and thine heart are not but for thy cove-
"tousness."[1] Nehemiah also, who enforced the payment of the dues to the priests and Levites, and at vast expense supported the cause of his people and his religion; would not make any advantage of his station, or suffer his servants to do it; or even take the emoluments which had been paid to former governors.[2] Can any man help perceiving that, if Christian kings, rulers, princes, and senates would thus spare in various other ways, that they might imitate these pious and zealous rulers of Judah; and see to it that a proper distribution was made of the sums thus appropriated, to things immediately connected with true religion; much indeed might be done without further burdening their subjects.

It is, in my view, no small confirmation of the point which I am desirous of establishing (namely, that the conduct of the pious kings of Israel and Judah was not adopted in obedience to any part of the ritual or political law of Moses, or by any establishment made in that law, but was intended as an example for kings and princes, professing Christianity, to imitate,) that the spirit of prophecy mentions the grand outlines of their

[1] Jer. xxii. 14—19.
[2] Neh. v. 8. 10, 14—19. x. 29—39. xiii. 10—13.

conduct, either as predicting it, or enjoining it on the princes who shall reign over Israel, in the approaching happy days of the church. The general prediction in Isaiah, that "kings shall be "nursing fathers, and their queens nursing "mothers,"[1] to the church, seems to imply all that has been stated, and much more; especially as compared with the prophecy in the sixtieth chapter. But how can kings, queens, and princes answer this character, or perform their duty, and improve their talent, in this respect, by a line of conduct resembling that of Gallio?[2] or without imitating Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, by employing their authority and wealth in the support of true religion, "according to the word of "God?" But, should kings and nobles copy the example of these pious rulers and princes of Israel: should they concur in exciting, encouraging, and requiring the ministers of religion to attend to their peculiar duties, with constancy and assiduity: should they take care that a suitable provision be made for them and their families, while thus employed; so as to preclude the temptation to leave the word of God to procure a maintenance, and the temptation to excuse this, which urgent poverty supplies: should they take care that all who are thus maintained apply themselves to the duties of their office; especially encouraging and countenancing the diligent and zealous: should kings and emperors, by their example, stimulate their nobles and more affluent subjects to offer willingly and liberally in this best of

[1] Is. xlix. 23. [2] Acts xviii. 12—17.

causes, and to retrench proportionably all needless expenses: and should all compulsive and persecuting measures be at the same time avoided; would they not then become indeed "nursing "fathers" to the church?

Whatever interpretation may be given of Ezekiel's last vision,[1] two things must be allowed: 1. That it is divinely inspired; and therefore has some appropriate and important meaning, which will at length be clearly understood: and, 2. That it is *prophetical*, and not *historical*; for nothing in the whole history of Israel, from the beginning to this day, at all accords to it. The order in which it is placed, subsequent to the restoration of Israel, and the prophecy of Gog and Magog, fixes the intended period to the expected glorious millennium. If it be interpreted exclusively of the state of restored Israel, during that happy period; yet it cannot be admitted that the ceremonial law of Moses, which the apostle (who, doubtless, was well acquainted with this part of "the oracles of God,") expressly declares was "waxing old and ready to *vanish away*,"[2] should be reinstated in full authority over the converts to Christianity: and, even if that could be admitted, several of the regulations given in it, concerning the prince and princes, and their conduct in religion, answer to nothing contained in the letter of that law. But, however that may be determined, those things which so exclusively belong to the Old Testament, as to be wholly inconsistent with the dispensation of the New,

[1] Ezek. xl—xlviii. [2] Heb. viii. 13.

can never be re-established among Christians. Yet scarcely one point in which we suppose that Christian kings should imitate Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, or Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, is omitted in this vision. A large portion of the land is required to be separated and allotted to the ministers of the sanctuary.[1] It is the prince's part to give "burnt-offerings,"[2] &c: that is, he shall, like Hezekiah and Josiah, (not to say Darius and Artaxerxes,) bear the expenses of the sacred worship of God, as circumstances may require.[3] And, indeed, the regulations concerning those priests who were to be admitted to exercise their sacred function, and those who must be excluded, are evidently given to the prince, or some person or persons exercising authority over the very chief priests themselves.[4] The prince also is every where spoken of as one of the worshippers; so that it would be mere trifling to endeavour to evade this, by saying, that Christ our Prince is meant.[5]

It has been intimated above, that, in some of these respects, even heathen kings used their authority and treasures in support of the instituted worship of Israel; and their assistance was accepted by pious Jews without the least scruple: so far was this interposition of princes in the cause of true religion, from being considered as a peculiar part of the Mosaic law, restricted to Israel alone. But then these heathen princes did it, without in

[1] Ezek. xlv. 1—5. xlviii. 8—20. [2] Ezek. xlv. 17—25.
[3] 2 Chr. xxxi. 24. xxxv. 7—8. Ezra vi. 8—10. vii. 15—24.
[4] Ezek. xliv. 3—16. [5] Ezek. xliv. 3. xlvi. 4, 8, 12.

the least attempting to interfere with the ministers of religion in their work, but entirely leaving, or even calling on them, to do all things "according "to the law," and commandment of JEHOVAH.[1] And therefore Ezra, Nehemiah, and others, not only accepted of their assistance, but solicited it, and blessed God for "putting it into their hearts;" nay, prayed to God to give them favour with the king, in their petitions about these matters.[2] But, if the heathen kings had endeavoured to model the religion of Israel according to their own reasoning notions, political purposes, or idolatrous usages; and to prescribe things contrary to the divine law; would such men as these have accepted and availed themselves of this conditional and mischievous support? Would they have prayed for it, or blessed and thanked God for putting such a thing into the king's heart? Would they have thought that the king helped "to beautify the temple," while he was requiring them to pollute it?

Now does not this draw the precise line, in which kingly interposition, in the great concerns of religion, may be desired, prayed for, and thankfully received? So long as "the commandment "of the king and his princes is according to the "word of God," it may be expected that "the "hand of God will be to give the people one "heart to do" that commandment; and that so great and extensive benefits will be vouchsafed by their means, as to excite us to bless the Lord for

[1] Ezra vii. 14, 18, 23, 25. [2] Ezra i. 1—10. ii. 1, 12. vi. 1—14. vii. 11—28. Neh. i. 11. ii. 4, 18.

"putting such a thing into their hearts." But, if they go beyond this, and attempt to new-model religion, according to their own notions, or in subserviency to their political purposes; to enjoin what is evidently incompatible with the sacred oracles, or to alter their essential truths, ordinances, and commandments: then all, who resemble Ezra and Nehemiah, will stand aloof, and not accept of such unscriptural support. They will think of Jeroboam, Ahaz, and Uzziah; and of Jewish priests, scribes, and rulers, who "made "void the commandment of God by their traditions;" and not of David, Solomon, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah: and this will induce them to decline the proffered aid, or protest against the presumptuous intrusion.

Even when regal, and princely, or senatorial support is connected with appendages which are *questionable;* and excite a doubt whether the things enjoined beyond the express word of God be not more than mere *circumstances;* (such as relate to the time or manner of administering sacred services, which, not being expressly mentioned in scripture, must by every religious company be arranged by some direction or agreement;) while some will probably be found too little cautious or suspicious of the object and effect of such interposition, and too eager improvidently to seize on the supposed advantage to the cause; it may also be inferred, that others will be over suspicious and scrupulous, at least in the judgment of their brethren. Now, as far as I have studied the subject, those who favour estab-

lishments, and desire the support of rulers and princes in the concerns of religion, have hitherto been too ready to welcome the whole, without due discrimination between what is scriptural and what is not: and the opponents of these things, are too prone to reject, or even reprobate altogether: as if David were equally to be dreaded with Jeroboam; Hezekiah with Ahaz; or Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes with Nebuchadnezzar, and his golden image, his stern decree and his fiery furnace; or with Antiochus Epiphanes. In opposition to undeniable facts, in the case of the pious kings of Israel and Judah, and even of the heathen princes who favoured the religion of Israel, they assume it as incontrovertible, that regal interposition, or that of senates or nobles, must be connected with political motives and objects; and with coercive or corrupting interference as to liberty of conscience. They assume that every alliance or connexion between those who are the ministers of God in his providence, as rulers, and those who are his ministers in the gospel of Christ, must render the latter in general willing slaves to the interests and passions, or ambitious and arbitrary projects, of the former; and so warp them from an honest regard to truth and duty, and even fetter the remnant of more conscientious persons, and cramp their efforts to do good. Not satisfied with attempting to shew that this hath been the case in many instances both past and present, or attacking this or the other establishment, or hierarchy; they assert that the consequences must necessarily in all instances be the same, and reprobate the very

principle itself. They indeed reason, or declaim, as if it were impossible for God himself to raise up princes, equally pious, and zealous, and attentive to the word of God in all their measures, with Hezekiah and Josiah; or ministers, even under the New Testament, equally mortified to all earthly things, as those were who carried into effect the commands of those pious princes.

It is beyond doubt, from these examples, that it is possible for princes and ministers of religion to combine in measures for promoting the true worship and service of God; for rectifying abuses, and reforming the church from idolatries, superstitions, and corruptions; for administering divine ordinances according to the word of God; and for promoting the general instruction of the people, with a simple aim to glorify God and do good to man; and without any selfish political objects; and even without interfering with true liberty of conscience, or using coercion or worldly lures, in accomplishing their objects. And that which, by the grace of God, hath been done, may, by the same grace, again be done; and to a far larger extent, with more permanent effect, and more glorious and happy consequences. "The thing "that hath been is the thing that shall be;" when all the kings of the nations shall fall down before the exalted Saviour, and become his devoted servants, in promoting the cause of truth, holiness, and godliness on earth. For these things we should hope, and pray, and wait: and, while writing this, I have no doubt that, ere long, even they (or others of the same sentiments coming in their place,) who now regard every thing that looks like

royal or imperial favour to the cause of Christ, as springing from some corrupt motive, some deep political selfish design; will be convinced by facts, that the thing, which to them seems "impossible, is possible with God," and hath certainly begun to be accomplished; and when they will join their brethren in blessing the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, for "putting such "things into the hearts" of kings and princes.

At the era of the Reformation, several of those eminent instruments, whom God raised up to effect that great and most important revolution in the affairs of Europe and of the world, were, it must be allowed, induced by concurrent circumstaces, to admit of regal and political interference, in the concerns of religion, too far; and to desire or employ the sword of the magistrate in things which are beside or beyond its commission: yet it may be questioned whether many in modern times have not gone into the opposite extreme. I do not mean as to toleration; for, provided the public peace be not endangered, the fullest toleration seems to be entirely scriptural. The only shadow of doubt is, whether direct outward gross idolatry ought to be tolerated. And here I should favour the affirmative, as nothing occurs to the contrary in the New Testament; and the command to punish idolaters was confined to those of Israel, and was a part of their political or judicial law. But the murder, perjury, and other crimes, connected with idolatrous worship, certainly ought not, on any consideration, to be tolerated by rulers professing Christianity.—If some object to the word *tolerate:* let them remember

that "the world lieth in the wicked one;" and, if God's servants are fully *tolerated* in such a world, it is an immense benefit and mercy.

Let it be noticed to Luther's honour, that he was the uniform opposer of persecution for things simply religious. On one or two points, however, I shall produce quotations, respecting some of the persons concerned in the Reformation, as bearing on the subjects discussed in this Treatise. In general, I cannot but think that there was much true wisdom, (though occasionally it was tarnished with worldly policy,) in effecting the reformation, as far as possible, without a violent and sudden subversion of all that men had been accustomed to; and in grafting, as it were, the intended alterations, where it could be done, on the existing state of things, distinguishing between the precious and the vile. For, where large bodies of men are suddenly, by entire and extensive innovations, unsettled from all former usages, it is no easy matter to keep them within any bounds of moderation, or to bring them to any settlement; as late events have shewn. Devastation and destruction are the inevitable consequences, which nothing but miracles can prevent: and the opposition of rulers and princes, in self-defence, must have a tendency (apart from direct malignant or suspicious persecution,) to increase exceedingly the difficulty and danger.—It seems also to me, that even the apostles themselves, and their coadjutors, introduced the Christian dispensation, in various particulars, and *as far as the case could possibly admit*, in the same manner; and with no violent innovation; none, not absolutely necessary. "The

"wisdom that is from above is first pure, then "peaceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, full of "mercy and good fruits, without partiality and "without hypocrisy: and the fruit of righteousness "is sown in peace of them that make peace."[1] In this silent manner Christian baptism gradually superseded circumcision, as the initiatory ordinance, the sacramental sign and seal of regeneration; the Lord's day succeeded to the sabbath of the Mosaic law; and many similar changes took place, by a leisurely process, without unsettling the minds of multitudes, not capable of acting properly at once in a new situation, which must have excited all their prejudices and passions, in the highest degree. These things, indeed, were conducted under the guidance and counsel of *inspired* men; and were altogether *right*, and models for imitation; but those of the reformation were managed by very wise and excellent, yet *uninspired* men; and therefore not in all respects right, but to be judged of according to the apostolical models.

In respect to provision for the ministers of religion, we may learn the matured judgment of Luther from the following quotation: 'Luther 'with great seriousness admonished the Elector,' (John, Elector of Saxony,) 'to make some pro-'vision for the poor labouring clergy. The Elector 'took all in good part; but appears to have been 'startled at the idea of augmenting the salaries of 'the clergy out of his own treasury: That, he 'said, would be a matter of great difficulty: and 'he asked Luther what he had to propose on the

[1] James iii. 14—18.

'subject. The answer was simply this: "In the 'general visitation of the whole country, let there 'be taken an accurate account of all *the ancient* 'revenues; and, if these be found insufficient for 'the purpose, then let the suitable payments to 'the officiating clergy be made from new imposts 'on the respective towns and parishes, which they 'may well bear, being now relieved from popish 'oppressions." Likewise, to a similar inquiry 'concerning the augmentation of the academical 'salaries, Luther replied: "There is an abundance 'of means for this purpose from the many vacant 'offices; for the number of the clergy in the 'collegiate church of All Saints is now reduced 'from eighty to eighteen. All the rest are dead, 'or have left their situations." The most expe-'rienced financier could scarcely have returned a 'better answer to the question. This redundant 'wealth was become very considerable, from the 'abolition of private masses, and many other 'protestant innovations. But it is allowed by 'historians, that not one halfpenny of it was ever 'applied by Frederick (the father of John,) to his 'own specific emolument.'[1]

Luther and Melancthon, and the reformers in general, considered the academies, or universities, as properly seminaries of instruction in the sacred scriptures, and in that learning which was suited to qualify men for the sacred ministry, or for filling up other situations in the community, as the well-instructed servants of Christ. In this

[1] Dean Milner's Continuation of the Rev. J. Milner's. Eccl. Hist. vol. iv. p. 965—967.

view, these would be equally intitled to support, on religious principle, as the labouring clergy.

Neither Luther, nor the other pious reformers in general, seem to have thought that the *tithes*, and other emoluments of the clergy, however, at that time, enormous and perverted, ought to be wholly alienated from the sacred use to which they had at first been given. These formed no part of the estates out of which they had been paid time immemorial; and could not be due to the possessors of those estates. Kings and nobles had no *right* to seize on them for secular purposes. They were far too large for the support, in any due moderation, of the officiating clergy, under any form of church government: but the general education of youth, according to their station, and the endowing or supporting of schools of learning, especially sacred learning, in every country of Europe, adequate to the emergency of the times, might have profitably employed the whole of them; at least with a proper reserve for the support of the pious and destitute aged: and the present and future generations may lament, that the princes and nobles, in the different countries concerned, did not follow the counsel of the reformers in this important matter, or imitate the noble disinterested conduct of the *wise* Frederick, Elector of Saxony.

It remains to be inquired, whether these reformers were, or were not, in this particular, wiser than those who, in modern times, would have the whole expenses of all such matters, and of every thing connected with them, left to voluntary contribution; because, in the primitive times, when

there had not been, nor could be, any funds freely assigned, or divinely appointed, these expenses were thus defrayed. And let it be remembered, that they who argue for this have to contend, not only with human wisdom in moderns, not only with the wisdom of God in Hezekiah, Josiah, and Nehemiah, but with the express institution of the divine law, as soon as the professors of true religion were become a nation.

How far voluntary contributions, without an establishment, or any permanent fund or revenue, could support, through populous nations, all the expenses for providing for ministers and their families, for erecting and keeping in repair places for public worship, and for seminaries of education, at present generally allowed to be expedient, if not necessary; the straitened, not to say distressed, circumstances of too many pious dissenting ministers, and the contributions raised, from many others besides dissenters, for several of these purposes, may enable the impartial reader to judge.

I shall add but one more quotation, in order to introduce a few observations on the subject: 'John, the new Elector of Saxony, conducted the 'religious concerns of his dominions in a manner 'quite different from that of his brother and pre-'decessor, Frederick. The latter connived at and 'tolerated, rather than avowed and established, 'the alterations introduced by Luther and his 'associates. But the former no sooner found 'himself in possession of the sovereign authority, 'than he exercised it with resolution and activity, 'by forming new ecclesiastical constitutions,

'*formed on the principles of the great reformer.*' After several satisfactory reasons, for the caution of Frederick's conduct, it follows, 'Neither should 'it be forgotten, that even Frederick himself had 'determined, a little before he died, to afford a 'more open and substantial support to the evan-'gelical preachers in his dominions: and this cir-'cumstance, no doubt, was an additional motive 'to his brother, and his nephew,' (John Frederick,) 'to enter on the work of reformation with vigour 'and dispatch.'[1]

Now, did Frederick, surnamed *the wise*, and John, surnamed *the good*, act scripturally, or unscripturally, or antiscripturally, in this part of their conduct? Would that God, who so highly approved of a similar conduct in Hezekiah and Josiah, and others under the ancient dispensation, (a conduct no where prescribed in the Mosaic ritual or *judicial* law, but exactly according to the first commandment of all, "Thou shalt love the "Lord thy God with all thy heart, and mind, and "soul, and strength;") would he, I say, condemn the same conduct in Frederick the wise and John the good? Was it the proper duty and improvement of talent in the rulers of Israel and Judah, and a presumptuous intrusion in the Electors of Saxony? Were they not, as far as their authority was exercised according to the word of God, as it appeared to them, truly interpreted by some of the most eminent theologians among uninspired men, who ever lived, as entirely to be distinguished from that of Charles the fifth of Ger-

[1] Dean Milner, ibid. p. 960—963.

many, or our king Henry the eighth; as that of the pious kings of Judah was to be distinguished from Jeroboam, from Ahaz, and Manasseh, or Antiochus Epiphanes?

Indeed, all the princes who favoured the Reformation used their authority in support of the reformers, most of them with great decision, and not always in an unexceptionable manner; nay, sometimes by very reprehensible measures. All the reformers, likewise, in one degree or other, sought and welcomed their support and concurrence, with more or less discrimination or caution. Luther and others did not wait for it, but went on in their efforts, without or against all human authority; but, when attainable, they availed themselves of it.

Now, if indeed the experience and progress in learning and knowledge, of much more than two hundred years, have enabled moderns to discover the mistakes and wrong steps of these illustrious men, (as many confidently presume that they do, who seem quite blind to their transcendent excellencies;) it is surely rather too much to say, "No "doubt we are the people, and wisdom shall die "with us," or at least it was born with us! Surely we ought to allow, that these persons, whom God honoured with a degree of usefulness almost rivalling that of the apostles, though they were not infallible, or right in every thing, were yet not mistaken in every thing, even of this nature; especially as no men in any age ever so diligently and carefully studied the whole of the oracles of God. And surely, instead of classing these Electors of Saxony, our Edward, and a few others, and all who

availed themselves of their countenance and assistance, with Charles the fifth, Henry the eighth, or even our illustrious queen Elizabeth, we should consider what was scriptural, and what not, in their several measures: we ought to distinguish between the precious and the vile; and, while we unite in condemning all compulsory and persecuting proceedings in matters of conscience, we should be careful not to condemn what God approved and commended in Hezekiah and Josiah.

Finally, if the reasoning in this Treatise be conclusive, it shews that the exercise of authority (with this[1] and a few other exceptions,) in the pious princes who favoured the Reformation was as much their duty, and the improvement of their talent, under the Christian dispensation, as that of the pious kings of Judah was in their days; and called on the friends of true religion, to thank God for putting such things into the hearts of their princes. And we also are called on to pray, that God would speedily, by putting such things into the heart of all kings and princes, render them, according to his sure word of prophecy, "NURSING FATHERS TO HIS CHURCH."

If, indeed, all concerned could be induced to agree, that *authority*, as well as *wealth*, might be improved as a talent in promoting the cause of God; and that princes and senates, individually and collectively, have duties in this respect as well as other men; and if all would employ their attention in carefully distinguishing between the *scrip-*

[1] That is, with the exception of 'all cumpulsory and persecuting proceedings.'—J. S.

tural exercise of this authority, and that which is contrary to scripture: if, in respect of existing establishments, those who dissent from them would candidly acknowledge what is right and good in them, and point out *calmly*, yet firmly, and with scriptural proof, not with general declamation, what they disapprove; and if, on the other hand, the zealous friends of establishments would not attempt to vindicate what cannot admit of scriptural vindication, and only plead with firmness and temper for what can be thus supported; the case would then become more hopeful. But, so long as, on one side, every thing is indiscriminately reprobated, and, on the other, indiscriminately justified, or even extolled, there can be no hope of *improvement* or of *peace;* and nations professing "the gospel of peace" must continue to resemble, not "a city that is at unity with "itself," but "a kingdom or house divided against "itself."—May "the God of peace" increase the number and active zeal of those who "endeavour "to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of "peace!"

Aston Sandford, March 28, 1817.

END OF THE NINTH VOLUME.